



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**DENATIONALIZED CITIZENSHIP THEORY:
WHAT IS THE ROLE OF CITIZENSHIP THEORY IN
HOMELAND SECURITY?**

by

Cherie A. Lombardi

December 2011

Thesis Advisor:
Second Reader:

Rodrigo Nieto-Gomez
Samuel Clovis

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE December 2011	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Denationalized Citizenship Theory: What Is The Role of Citizenship Theory In Homeland Security?			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Cherie A.i Lombardi				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING /MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government. IRB Protocol number ____N/A____.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) <p>The homeland security community interacts with U.S. citizens every day and the national strategy for homeland security calls for an active and engaged citizenry to play a significant part in homeland security. The naturalization process that makes new citizens and to the many international variables, such as dual citizenship, that affect any interaction with many naturalized U.S. citizens is often overlooked. This thesis presents a qualitative synthesis of the different types of citizenship theory to discover what aspects of this theoretical work are relevant to homeland security. The synthesis of the global, cosmopolitan, diaspora, multicultural, post- and transnational types of citizenship theory produced recommendations for the homeland security community to pay greater attention to and act upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The greater and continuing interaction between immigrants and their countries of origin. • The countries of origins' greater interest and continuing interaction in their migrant populations. • Greater understanding of immigrant cultures and histories to better enhance interaction. <p>The need to make U.S. citizenship significant to naturalized citizens to keep them engaged here as much as they are with their countries of origin. 5) The need to standardize the U.S. government's policy towards dual and multiple citizenship status.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Citizenship, Homeland Security, Loyalty, Allegiance, Integration, Radicalization, Global, Cosmopolitan, Denationalized, Diaspora, Multicultural			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 123	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**DENATIONALIZED CITIZENSHIP THEORY:
WHAT IS THE ROLE OF CITIZENSHIP THEORY IN HOMELAND SECURITY?**

Cherie A. Lombardi
Adjudications Officer, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Washington,
D.C.
B.A., University of Oregon, 1986

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

**MASTER OF ARTS IN SECURITY STUDIES
(HOMELAND SECURITY AND DEFENSE)**

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2011**

Author: Cherie A. Lombardi

Approved by: Rodrigo Nieto-Gomez
Thesis Advisor

Samuel Clovis
Second Reader

Daniel Moran, PhD
Chair, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

The homeland security community interacts with U.S. citizens every day and the national strategy for homeland security calls for an active and engaged citizenry to play a significant part in homeland security. The naturalization process that makes new citizens and to the many international variables, such as dual citizenship, that affect any interaction with many naturalized U.S. citizens is often overlooked. This thesis presents a qualitative synthesis of the different types of citizenship theory to discover what aspects of this theoretical work are relevant to homeland security. The synthesis of the global, cosmopolitan, diaspora, multicultural, post- and transnational types of citizenship theory produced recommendations for the homeland security community to pay greater attention to and act upon:

- The greater and continuing interaction between immigrants and their countries of origin.
- The countries of origins' greater interest and continuing interaction in their migrant populations.
- Greater understanding of immigrant cultures and histories to better enhance interaction.

The need to make U.S. citizenship significant to naturalized citizens to keep them engaged here as much as they are with their countries of origin. 5)
The need to standardize the U.S. government's policy towards dual and multiple citizenship status.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	13
A.	GLOBAL AND COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENSHIP THEORY: “HUMANIST”	16
B.	DIASPORA AND MULTICULTURALIST CITIZENSHIP THEORY: “GROUP RIGHTS”	25
C.	POSTNATIONAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP THEORY	40
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	49
A.	METHOD, ADAPTATIONS, AND REASONS FOR THE SAME.....	49
B.	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH SYNTHESIS: THE STEP-BY-STEP PROCESS AND ADAPTATIONS THEREOF	50
IV.	SYNTHESIS.....	55
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	71
A.	THE MOST RELEVANT ELEMENTS OF CITIZENSHIP THEORY FOR HOMELAND SECURITY	78
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	81
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	109

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CBO	Community-based Organization
CBP	U.S. Customs and Border Protection
DEA	Drug Enforcement Agency
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	Department of Justice
FAIR	Federation for American Immigration Reform
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigations
NSA	National Security Agency
TSA	Transportation Security Administration
USCIS	U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wants to thank Bernie, my husband, who was willing to marry me as I began this program, Jennefer, my friend and unofficial reader, and Jaime, my boss, for allowing me this great opportunity, and for everyone who let me talk about my thesis too often.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

Scenario 1—“*The Loyalty Oath*”: Mr. Talal Khan, a dual citizen of Pakistan and the United States, has applied to become an analyst with the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI). He has successfully completed the application process, the interview, the security clearance and the lie detector test. But, before he is told what day he will start his new job, he is presented with one last form to complete and sign, a loyalty oath for dual citizens attesting that the United States of America will receive his primary loyalty while he works for the U.S. government.

Scenario 2—“*Basic English?*”: A Transportation Security Administration (TSA) officer at the airport in Lincoln, Nebraska watches as a middle age couple of apparent Asian descent and a young man approach the security line. The young man stops short of entering the line but appears to explain the procedure for jacket and shoe removal, placing carry-on bags on the conveyor belt, etc., to the couple in a foreign language. As the gentleman draws near, the officer asks for his boarding pass and government-issued ID. The man looks back at the young man one more time and is told something in a foreign language. The man then turns and hands his boarding pass and U.S. passport to the TSA Officer. The woman traveling with him repeats the same actions when it is her turn to present her ID to the officer.

Scenario 3—“*The Rescue*”: Fighting has broken out in Beirut and endangers a large group of U.S. citizens living in the city. The U.S. Department of State sets up a processing station on the coast to get the citizens onto waiting boats and out of the warzone. A typical scene is of an extended family: grandparents, parents, children, aunts and uncles, nieces and nephews, some 18 in all, crowding forward to have their information put into the computer so they can board the boat. Unfortunately, only three of the family members have U.S. passports and birth certificates, as well as Lebanese passports and citizenship as well, all the rest are simply citizens of Lebanon.

Scenario 4 - “Security Problem?”: A young man of Somali descent disembarks a plane in Detroit, Michigan on his way home after traveling back to Kenya to see relatives living there. He follows the other passengers to the Customs and Border Protection (CBP) inspection lines and gets into the one marked “U.S. Citizens.” He hands his blue jacketed U.S. passport over to the CBP Officer and answers a few questions. While talking to the young man, the CBP Officer flips through the passport and notices entry and exit stamps for Pakistan, Yemen, Kenya, and Djibouti. The young man has been out of the country for the past 6 months but claims nothing more than a minimum wage job in the United States.

The four scenarios presented above all involve three main factors: U.S. citizens, international connections, residences, travel, or legal status of the U.S. citizens; and the U.S. federal government or one of its officers. They also present four distinct instances when the fact of a person’s U.S. citizenship is *not* the defining or deciding factor in the interaction, and each individual’s international status, travel, or connections makes for a situation that cannot be labeled “routine.” The reason for this is that in each instance there is either a *legal* (“the Loyalty Oath”), *awkward* (“Basic English?”), *complex* (“the Rescue”) or *potentially dangerous* (“Security Problem?”) twist to an interaction between a government official or entity and a U.S. citizen. Furthermore, the reason for the twist in each scenario is an international variable: dual citizenship (“the Loyalty Oath”); refusal to speak English (“Basic English?”); dual citizenship and non-U.S. residence (“the Rescue”); and international travel to areas of known anti-U.S. terrorist activity including recruitment and training.

Each scenario also presents a different set of assumptions most likely made by the federal government entity and/or official in each scenario based on the U.S. citizenship of each individual that may, or may not, affect any subsequent actions taken by the government entity or official involved. “The Loyalty Oath” shows a difference in the assumptions the FBI makes about the loyalty of a citizen of the United States only, and a U.S. citizen who holds a

second (or possibly multiple other) citizenships in that the dual citizen is required to sign a loyalty oath not required of U.S.-only citizens.

“Basic English?” presents the probable assumption or assumptions most people would make if a U.S. citizen is not able to speak English at some level. While it is true that many U.S. citizens know little about the naturalization process this couple most likely went through to gain their citizenship, many do know that there is some requirement for the ability to speak and understand some level of English. And, even though it is not the responsibility of a TSA Officer conducting airport security checks to question why the couple cannot, or will not, speak English, the lack of that skill may cause the TSA Officer to pay closer attention to them than if they were not using an interpreter while holding U.S. passports.

“The Rescue” is not an uncommon problem whenever the State Department is involved in assisting U.S. citizens who have returned to live in their countries of birth, or former residence, but it does make an already tense situation that much more complicated. After all, the State Department is responsible to provide for the safety of *U.S. citizens* and, even in such emergencies, there are time, space and funding considerations that must be taken into account. Simply allowing the Lebanese relatives of the U.S. citizens to travel could prevent other U.S. citizens from being transported to safety. Taking the time to explain the problem and work it out with the U.S. citizens in the family will also take time away from processing other U.S. citizens for their removal. There is also the matter of how the Lebanese-American population in the United States will react to whatever decisions are made in Beirut. No matter what actions the U.S. citizens may assume the State Department will be able to take for their non-U.S. citizen relatives, their presence compounds an already complicated situation.

“Security Problem?” is even more complicated in that the young Somali-American will act on the assumption that he is a U.S. citizen returning to his home, which is, normally, a relatively easy matter. The CBP Officer, on the other hand, has been briefed on other U.S. citizens from Somalia who have traveled to

be trained as terrorists and/or been involved in terrorist activities while abroad, and he is now faced with a U.S. citizen whose travel records appear to fit the possible terrorist-related scenario and, thus, he can no longer act on the simple assumption that the man in front of him is merely a U.S. citizen returning home. No matter the scenario then, there is some international factor involved that definitely, or potentially, alters the perceptions the federal government entities or officers would most likely have when dealing with a U.S. citizen who holds no other citizenship status, does not reside outside the United States, speaks passable English and does not match any security alert information.

The four scenarios presented, and the international factors that change each from run-of-the-mill interactions to ones with legal, awkward, complex and/or potentially dangerous possibilities, also reflect more significant changes in how citizenship is perceived and used internationally that do not appear to be addressed by current understanding of the meaning of citizenship in the United States, or in U.S. citizenship policy and practice. The existence of Mr. Khan's dual citizenship in "the Loyalty Oath" and the FBI's separate loyalty oath¹ for dual or multi-citizens represents one government agency's adaptation to the existence of a legal status that the U.S. government does not endorse as a matter of policy, namely, dual/multiple citizenship. Per the *Adjudicator's Field Manual* of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), which administers U.S. immigration law, the United States' official stance on dual citizenship is:

The U.S. Government recognizes that dual citizenship exists, but does not endorse it as a matter of policy because of the problems that it may cause. Dual citizens owe allegiance to both the United States and the foreign country. They are required to obey the laws of both countries. Either country has the right to enforce its laws, particularly if the person later travels there. There may be a conflict with the U.S. laws, which may cause problems for the dual citizen.

¹ Form FD-1052, "Federal Bureau of Investigation Loyalty Agreement," (version March 9, 2009) under "Forms," <http://www.fbijobs.gov/employment/FD1052.pdf> (accessed February 12, 2011).

Additionally, dual citizenship may limit the United States Government's efforts to assist United States citizens abroad.²

Thus, the United States government's perspective of dual citizenship is still based mainly on considerations of allegiance and potential legal complications, but no national or government-wide policy on how to work with persons holding dual citizenship exists at this time.

The couple in "Basic English?" brings into question just how well the U.S. naturalization process is doing at integrating new citizens into American society when the ability to speak and understand basic English is an eligibility requirement of the process,³ as well as part of what it means to be a U.S. citizen. For, while there is nothing wrong with being more comfortable speaking another language, and English use is not required within the United States, the couples' refusal to use English in a fairly straight-forward circumstance may lead to certain assumptions on the part of the TSA Officer. One assumption may be that the couple are unable to speak English and, thus, were ineligible to naturalize and, subsequently, receive U.S. citizenship and obtain the passports. A second assumption could be that they only became citizens as a matter of convenience and, thus, see no need to speak English. A third assumption may be that they did not naturalize at all but, rather, obtained the passports through unlawful means. None of these assumptions reflect a significant level of integration into American society or any substantive measure of allegiance to the United States.

2 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Adjudicator's Field Manual, Chapter 75, Section 75.3 Ceremony-Related Issues, under "Dual Citizenship," <http://dhsconnect.dhs.gov/uscis/workingresources/Source/docView/AFM/HTML/AFM/0-0-0-1/0-0-0-26406/0-0-0-27044.html#0-0-0-2390> (accessed October 19, 2011).

3 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Immigration and Nationality Act, Section 312(a)(1), "Requirements As To Understanding The English Language, History, Principles, And Form Of Government Of The United States" under "Naturalization," <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.f6da51a2342135be7e9d7a10e0dc91a0/?vgnnextto id=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&CH=act> (accessed October 19, 2011).

“The Rescue” makes the government address the question of where to draw the line in providing protection to its own citizens and their families when not everyone holds the same legal status or when the citizens hold dual or multi-citizenships and no longer reside in the United States “Security Problem?,” like “Basic English?,” again questions the integrative capability of either the U.S. naturalization process, if the young man gained U.S. citizenship in that way, or the integration of the Somali immigrant population in the United States overall if the young man was born a U.S. citizen but raised in that community. “Security Problem?” also raises the question of just how well, if at all, U.S. citizenship status serves as a means to stop the radicalization of the immigrant and U.S. citizen populations for terrorist purposes and how the government handles the results when it does not work.

The questions raised in each scenario all touch upon areas of concern to the homeland security community, including the loyalty of government personnel (“the Loyalty Oath”); the integration of immigrants into American society, including the question of where their main loyalties lie (“Basic English?” & “Security Problem?”), the impact that U.S. foreign policy in general and the protection of U.S. citizens overseas has on homeland security (“the Rescue”), and how the government prevents the radicalization of both its immigrant and citizen populations (“Security Problem?”). They also emphasize how government perceptions of U.S. citizenship impact homeland security personnel’s interaction with the same, and yet, the topic of citizenship rarely comes up in discussion about the U.S.’ homeland security concerns.

For example, in a 2009 report, “Policy Challenges in International Migration”⁴ from the Congressional Research Service, while global economic and security challenges are discussed, citizenship is only found in a footnote and then not in reference to homeland or national security. Similarly, and from the

⁴ Congressional Research Service, Policy Challenges in International Migration, by Chad C. Haddal. U.S. Library of Congress (Washington, D.C.: August 11, 2009), under “citizenship,” <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=34294> (accessed December 12, 2010).

more anti-immigration perspective, the checklist of “unfinished reforms” of the U.S. immigration system outlined in the report by Jack Martin for the Federation For American Immigration Reform (FAIR), of September 2008, talks about tracking immigrants, their exit and entry information and stronger controls on the visa process, among other measures, but no mention is made of the citizenship side of immigration in the United States.⁵

Even when the integration or assimilation of the immigrant community is discussed in detail in terms of homeland and/or national security, the citizenship process and U.S. citizenship itself are, somehow, left out of the conversation. John Fonte’s article, “Needed A Patriotic Assimilation Policy,”⁶ serves as example of this when it calls for ensuring the “health of American democracy”⁷ through the patriotic assimilation of immigrants, in order to bring them to adopt American civic values and the American heritage as his or her own,⁸ but does not mention naturalization or citizenship as part of the assimilation process.

This seeming lack of concern about or, more likely, lack of attention played to the role of citizenship in general, and the title of “U.S. citizen” specifically, and its importance to homeland security, stands in sharp contrast to the frequency in which the role of U.S. citizens in homeland security is invoked in the main homeland and national security strategies that are meant to guide the nation’s homeland security community in its efforts. For example, “citizen” or “citizenry”—and least often in the context of who has to be protected—is used

⁵ Jack Martin, “Immigration and National Security: A Checklist of Unfinished Reforms,” (report for Federation For American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Washington, D.C., September 2008) http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/2008_911Report.pdf (accessed February 14, 2011).

⁶ John Fonte, “Needed A Patriotic Assimilation Policy,” *The Social Contract* 16, No. 3 (Spring 2006), under “citizenship” http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1603/article_1390_printer.shtml (accessed April 22, 2011).

⁷ Ibid., 2.

⁸ Ibid.

twenty-seven times in the *National Security Strategy*⁹ of 2010, twenty-four times in the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*¹⁰ from 2007 and eleven times in the latest *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report*¹¹ (all examples excluding the use of “citizenship” in the context of “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services”). In both of the national strategies, the discussion of citizenship mostly concerns the need for a citizenry that is “dynamic”¹² and “engaged”¹³ both in helping the economy grow, and in actively participating in the governance of the nation.

The Quadrennial report does, at least, address naturalization and citizenship directly during its discussion of the importance of immigration to the homeland security enterprise.¹⁴ Unfortunately, it is only to stress that efforts to integrate the immigrant community should include advocating naturalization so they too can “embrace the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.”¹⁵ None of these documents address any international variables of the types that figure so prominently in the four scenarios of “the Loyalty Oath,” “Basic English?,” “the Rescue” or “Security Problem?” even though such variables are not uncommon amongst the current immigrant population in the United States. In fact, the overall impression one gains from these documents is that citizenship in the U.S.

⁹ *National Security Strategy*, (May 2010) under “National Security Strategy 2010,” http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf (accessed June 20, 2010).

¹⁰ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, (October 2007) under “National Strategy for Homeland Security,” http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf (accessed June 20, 2010).

¹¹ Department of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland*, (February 2010) under “Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report,” www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf (accessed June 20, 2010).

¹² *National Security Strategy*, 17.

¹³ Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, 14.

¹⁴ Department of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report*, 51.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

is treated as a singular status without variation by the government, which does coincide with the fact that the U.S. government does not officially endorse dual citizenship as mentioned earlier.

A further measure of the U.S. government's unvarying perception of citizenship, beyond that found in the Immigration and Nationality Act,¹⁶ may be seen in the main document upon which naturalization and citizenship policy is currently based, titled, "Building an Americanization Movement for the Twenty-first Century."¹⁷ The term "Americanization" was borrowed from the movement to assimilate immigrants into American society that existed from the early 1900s through the 1930s and involved a concerted effort by local, state, and federal government, the education system, community, charity and service organizations and even corporations to help the immigrant population come to live, work and be Americans.¹⁸ The new Americanization calls for a similar coordination of effort among the different actors in American society who interact with the immigrant population in order to, once again, help with its assimilation into American society through "embracing shared political principles, which exemplify democratic traditions and build a sense of community and common identity as Americans."¹⁹ While this document admits that each immigrant may enjoy his or her own ethnic culture and religion, the final expectation is that each person will assimilate, politically, and, along with native-born U.S. citizens, "uphold and pledge allegiance to foundational principles enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States."²⁰

¹⁶ *Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952* as amended, Public Law 82-414, 66 Statute 163, 82nd Congress (June 27, 1952), under "laws" <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.f6da51a2342135be7e9d7a10e0dc91a0/?vgnextoid=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&CH=act> (accessed October 28, 2011).

¹⁷ Task Force on New Americans, "Building an Americanization Movement for the Twenty-first Century: A Report to the President of the United States from the Task Force on New Americans," under "Americanization" <http://www.uscis.gov/files/nativedocuments/M-708.pdf> (accessed December 15, 2010).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁹ Task Force on New Americans, "Building an Americanization Movement," 2.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 1.

This continued focus on the singularity of U.S. citizenship, while not unexpected on the part of the U.S. government, does not address the types of international variables many U.S. citizens consider integral to their existence. For example, the dual citizenship that the United States has yet to address in any standardized manner or to look at from any perspective not based solely on historical precedent is ever more common among immigrant-sending nations. While it is possible the Americanization movement may help with immigrant assimilation, it also may not since it does not address, in any significant way, the political involvement many immigrants still have in their countries of origin. Finally, there is no overall policy for how the U.S. government should interact with U.S. citizens with the kinds of international variables discussed in “the Loyalty Oath,” “Basic English?,” “the Rescue” and “Security Problem?”

The scenarios presented above identify four ways in which citizenship impacts homeland security, and four instances where the citizenship involved either included international factors outside the norm, or brought into question the effectiveness of and/or accuracy of the U.S. government and homeland security community’s current understanding of U.S. citizenship and citizenship policy. This thesis will examine citizenship theory for any insights it may provide and how it may be of use to the homeland security community in its work with the American populace in general, its efforts to promote the greater integration of the immigrant population into American society and their acquisition of U.S. citizenship, as well as its work with the international community. The primary question to be answered will be:

What are the main elements of citizenship theory and how are those elements relevant to homeland security?

Secondary questions that will also be addressed in the search for answers to the primary are:

1. What is citizenship theory and what is it based on?
2. What useful information and ideas can the homeland security community find in citizenship theory?

3. What policies and/or actions may be recommended to the homeland security community from the information gleaned from the analysis and synthesis of citizenship theory?

The information gained from answering these questions should provide the homeland security community with a greater understanding of the theory of citizenship, its actual or possible impact on citizenship in the United States, and on homeland security concerns in particular.

The first step will be to present the results of a review of the current literature available on citizenship. The next step will be a description of the methodology used to fulfill the thesis purpose and answer the research question. After that will be the synthesis of citizenship theory in order to discover any points relevant to the homeland security enterprise. The final step will be to present some recommendations for the homeland security community based on the information revealed through the synthesis of citizenship theory, and a call for further research on citizenship and other similar areas that should be of concern to the homeland security community but are not addressed fully, or not at all, by current homeland security strategies.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The amount of literature available on citizenship is nothing short of vast, and yet, there is no specific part of the citizenship theory literature that directly addresses homeland security beyond the occasional mention of security concerns in specific citizenship cases or situations.²¹ So, while any online search produces thousands of hits, and even the academic databases show hundreds of works including the word “citizenship” in their titles and text, it was not possible to do a literature review specific to this thesis. Since the huge volume also moves a “comprehensive” literature review beyond the scope possible for this thesis, works were sought to provide an overview of the major types of citizenship theory currently under discussion in academia. Thus, the cross-section of literature reviewed here does represent the major types of citizenship theory currently of interest to scholars and theorists. The works reviewed here were, for the most part, published between 2005 and 2011 that discuss the definition and/or meaning of citizenship in general or one of the main types of citizenship theory: global, cosmopolitan, multicultural, diaspora, postnational or transnational. Works that consider citizenship in more narrow terms, such as religion, gender, sexual orientation, etc., have been excluded as they generally deal with citizenship rights based on group or community membership, and that general topic will be covered in the discussion of the diaspora and multicultural types of citizenship theory. A few older works have also been included for background information.

Citizenship theory is almost as varied in types as in the number of works available, as there are multiple works about each type as well as works that discuss multiple types of theory. Overlapping themes and concerns, interchangeable use of terminology, and a general lack of universally accepted definitions for the different types of citizenship theory are also common to the literature as a whole. For the purposes of this thesis and literature review, the

²¹ Leti Volpp, “Citizenship Undone,” *Fordham Law Review* 75, Issue 5, (2006-2007), under “Citizenship” <http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu> (accessed December 10, 2010).

main types to be discussed are: global and cosmopolitan, diaspora and multicultural, postnational and transnational. As mentioned earlier, works addressing such specific issues of citizens as: gender, sexual orientation, religion, etc., are not, for the most part, addressed herein as a separate group though their call for citizenship rights based on group/community membership will be discussed in general. Furthermore, the sheer number of works read also precludes both a reiteration and review of each work in this space so the emphasis will be on general overall discussion and individual review where most relevant.

The definition of “citizenship,” beyond the legal definitions that outline specific rights and responsibilities, has long been a matter of much discussion. That debate continues to grow as theorists, researchers, philosophers, policy-makers and think tanks continue to try and add new dimensions of meaning to the word. There is the further complication of the use of the word “nationality” in the same context and, sometimes, even interchangeably with “citizenship,” though, for the purposes of this thesis, citizenship will be used as exclusively as possible. This thesis will define citizenship as being the legal status of a citizen within a nation-state with certain rights and responsibilities including the ability to vote in all levels of elections, hold elected office and serve in the national government at any level as the baseline for this work.

Due to the ongoing expansion of the use of the word “citizenship” far beyond the traditional nation-based definition, there are similar overlaps in the meaning and use of the types of citizenship theory categories as well. The groupings of citizenship theory types used in this thesis are those that best correspond to their relevance to the homeland security enterprise in the opinion of this researcher, thus, variations in theory type usage are to be expected when the original works reviewed here are consulted. The groupings used herein are labeled as follows:

- “Humanist” for global and cosmopolitan since these types of theory call for the broadest and most universal use of the concept of citizenship to include all of humanity.
- “Group Rights” for diaspora and multicultural since these types of theory focus most on the use of ethnic, cultural, religious and other group identities as a basis for the receipt of citizenship rights.
- “Post and Transnational” for postnational and transnational since these two types of citizenship theory draw most often on the affects of globalization, specifically economic globalization, on citizenship as their main focus beyond their call for citizenship that moves beyond the nation-state for its legitimacy.

These categorizations allow the researcher to consider their relevance to the homeland security enterprise from the different perspectives they represent. “Humanist” being the most intellectual and philosophical, as these types of theory are most often discussed as a personal perspective on citizenship, generally without making a call for the creation of any global political structure. “Group rights” should prove most relevant to such homeland security concerns as immigrant integration and prevention of radicalization since it discusses how different communities within the political community see their place and want to be treated as specific entities within the nation as a whole. “Post and transnational,” with its discussions of globalization, which affects international relations, economics, global interconnectivity, and the reasons for mass migration, should provide information and ideas relevant to how homeland security works on an international level and is viewed around the world. These groupings are based on general characteristics of the citizenship theory types discussed, as there are also many areas in which each type overlaps with another through shared concepts and goals. The review begins with a look at humanist theory, which is the most intellectual of the three groups of citizenship theory in that the main arguments in its favor are based on philosophy, morality, and democratic ideals.

A. GLOBAL AND COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENSHIP THEORY: “HUMANIST”

Global and cosmopolitan citizenship theory (called “humanist” from here on for its emphasis on each person being a member of and accepting an obligation to all of humanity) may be described as the most all encompassing and yet, uniquely individual, of all the types of citizenship theory currently under discussion. This is due to the fact that while humanist citizenship has no boundaries such as national borders, geographic regions, or group identifiers like religion, nationality, or ethnicity, it is presented as a choice that is ultimately personal in nature, though with a focus on one’s obligations to all humanity rather than to oneself.²² The philosophical motivation for global citizenship is taken even further when it is tied to the idea of each person striving to become a “pure being”²³ that has “a citizenship that is not in opposition to the world but rather in concert with it.”²⁴

Perhaps one of the most well-known, and certainly often quoted, philosophical advocates of the humanist type of citizenship theory, specifically, cosmopolitanism, is Professor Martha Nussbaum of the University of Chicago. Her essay, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism,”²⁵ traces the origins of the concept from its first articulations among the ancient Greeks (i.e., Diogenes) to the Roman Stoics and how Kant’s later work was influenced by both,²⁶ and, in doing so, covers the basics of the concept quite well.

²² Alessandra Beasley, “Public Discourse and Cosmopolitan Political Identity: Imagining the European Union Citizen.” *Futures* 38, Issue 2 (March 2006) 134, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328705000820> (accessed April 10, 2011).

²³ Evan Smith, “Being as Being: A Phenomenology of Citizenship Amid the Crisis of Modern Nihilism” (paper presented at San Francisco University Harbour Centre, San Francisco, CA, November 8, 2006): 58, <http://journals.sfu.ca/humanitas/index.php/humanities/article/viewFile/6/10> (accessed March 23, 2011).

²⁴ Ibid., 63.

²⁵ Martha Nussbaum, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism,” in *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), under “Nussbaum,” <http://www.newschool.edu/tcds/krakow/KR08COS/Session5/M.Nussbaum-KantandCosmopolitanism.pdf> (accessed October 10, 2011).

²⁶ Ibid., 28.

Based on the tenet that all humans are worthy of respect as beings capable of reason and moral capacity,²⁷ Nussbaum sees humanist citizenship theory as advocating that,

We should give our first moral allegiance to no mere form of government, no temporal power. We should give it, instead, to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings.²⁸

She continues on in this vein saying that this individual perspective, when accepted by humanity as a whole, will make the problems facing the whole world easier to solve as we will “face them in this way, as fellow human beings respecting one another.”²⁹ Furthermore, this same individual perspective of the world as one community of humanity should allow for the creation of political institutions that are “structured around a mature recognition of equal personhood and humanity.”³⁰

Nussbaum’s recipe for the achievement of humanist citizenship includes the need for the early education of children in order to get them to view all people as “bearers of an equal moral dignity, as members of a single body and as single set of purposes, and as no longer impossibly alien or threatening.”³¹ She also calls for using this humanist citizenship theory as a “regulative ideal” upon which to “design institutions in ways that appropriately reflect the respect for humanity involved in it.”³² Finally, though she does not see much cosmopolitanism in the

²⁷ Martha Nussbaum, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism,” in *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant’s Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1997), under “Nussbaum,” <http://www.newschool.edu/tcds/krakow/KR08COS/Session5/M.Nussbaum-KantandCosmopolitanism.pdf> (accessed October 10, 2011), 31.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Nussbaum, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism,” 31.

³⁰ Nussbaum, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism,” 31.

³¹ Ibid., 48.

³² Ibid., 49.

current forms of government most anywhere in the world at the time of writing, she holds out hope for the possibility of this type of humanist citizenship taking hold in the world in the future.³³

Overall, Nussbaum's discussion, while written to show how Kant's work on cosmopolitanism grew from the ancient Greek and Roman writings, provides a comprehensive overview of the concept and succeeds in tying this ancient philosophical idea into the present day as well. But, as mentioned in the introduction to this review, not all of citizenship theory and, most specifically, humanist citizenship theory, involves discussions of topics specific to homeland security enterprise beyond a reminder of the philosophical underpinnings of the concept of citizenship in general.

There is another aspect of humanist citizenship theory that also discusses the individual's moral obligations toward humanity but, in an apparent effort to make the theory more relevant to citizenship policy decision-makers who for most of the world still function on the national level, focuses more on the morality of democratic ideals, rather than their philosophical foundation. Professor Joseph Carens of the University of Toronto is a well-known advocate of morality-based humanist citizenship theory, whose work takes the more unique step and discusses possible practical application of the theory on a national basis as well. In "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship,"³⁴ Carens advocates the idea that anyone who lives within a democracy has a moral right to citizenship in the same and the government should recognize that right without imposing any restrictions on gaining that status beyond a short term of residence.³⁵ The basis of his argument is that a democratic nation that works to achieve equality within its population (as in "all men are created equal") and, most especially among its

³³ Nussbaum, "Kant and Cosmopolitanism," 51.

³⁴ Joseph H. Carens, "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship," Oliver Schmidtke and Saime Ozcurumez, eds., *Of States, Rights, and Social Closure: Governing Migration and Citizenship* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008): 17–36.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 1–2.

citizens, cannot consider its citizenship policy as morally-based unless it considers how the policy affects those who it excludes as much as those who are included in the political community.³⁶

In the case of democratic nations of immigrants such as the United States and Canada this moral argument means immigrants and their children, no matter their legal status, must not be excluded from the rights and benefits of citizenship when they are subject to the laws and governance of the nation on account of their residence within its borders. Carens backs up his assertion by discussing how there are few rights, beyond voting and eligibility to public sector jobs, available only to citizens in modern democracies and this should be yet another reason for citizenship status to be easily obtainable within a democratic nation-state. These moral considerations are also his basis for calling for a naturalization system that does not make demands of immigrants, beyond simple residency, that are not also made of those who are native born, or who derive citizenship through bloodlines.³⁷ This is the only way he sees possible for a democracy to achieve the equal citizenship that is part of its founding principles. Overall, Carens presents the moral arguments that define the humanist type of citizenship theory in a straight-forward manner that also considers counter-arguments, and firmly grounds the theory in the real world by presenting possibilities for its use in the real world.

“Making the Impossible Possible: Global Citizenship in Morality, Education, and Practice,” by Heather R. McDougall, is another work that discusses global citizenship as a mostly moral imperative, providing an overview of others’ work and her own interpretation as well. More specifically, McDougall

³⁶ Joseph H. Carens, “Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship,” Oliver Schmidtke and Saime Ozcurumez, eds., *Of States, Rights, and Social Closure: Governing Migration and Citizenship* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008): 8.

³⁷ Carens, “Immigration, Democracy and Citizenship,” 11.

calls humanist citizenship a “moral disposition” that should guide individuals in their interactions with others on all levels, from local to international.³⁸

A key component of McDougall’s discussion is the idea that there are three dimensions to humanist citizenship: political, legal, and moral.³⁹ The goal of humanist citizenship in the legal arena is not, generally, to expand or enlarge the size of the political or social community so much as to expand the choice of the individual to include all of humanity as their own community.⁴⁰ The specific tie to citizenship then is the call for the removal of restrictions as to where an individual may choose to work and live that are imposed by the current system of nation-based citizenship.⁴¹ In the political and legal realms, the focus is on ensuring human rights around the world, and how the “nation and transnation can create policies which will protect”⁴² those rights. The moral component, which she labels, specifically, as “cosmopolitanism,” emphasizes the individual and his or her understanding of each person’s moral obligation to humanity as a whole.⁴³

McDougall discusses the works of Martha Nussbaum and Vaclav Havel, the dissident who became the first President of the Czech Republic, in detail⁴⁴ to provide the philosophical foundation for the theory and greater dimension to the call for the individual’s obligation to humanity. Havel, like Nussbaum, emphasized the need for the individual to respect all of humanity as equals. She then turns to the work of William Hitt, author of *The Global Citizen*, whose model of citizenship

³⁸ Heather R. McDougall, “Making the Impossible Possible: Global Citizenship in Morality, Education, and Practice” (paper prepared for 2005 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.): 3, under “citizenship,” http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/apsa/apsa05/index.php?click_key=2 (accessed February 15, 2011).

³⁹ Ibid., 9.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 10.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., 12.

⁴³ McDougall, “Making the Impossible Possible...,” 13.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 13–20.

involves four types: spectator, patriot, cosmopolitan and global.⁴⁵ Each type represents both the level of understanding the individual has of his or her place in the world, along with the level of participation he or she has in the political and social communities, from the local to the international level.⁴⁶ McDougall presents the ideas of Nussbaum, Havel, and Hitt as the foundation for humanist citizenship and, in Hitt's case, as an example of how the current humanist citizenship concepts are quite rigid in their makeup. This provides a solid basis from which she then presents her own call for a more fluid way to consider humanist citizenship as a moral disposition that guides individuals in their responsibilities as members of local and global communities.⁴⁷ This emphasizes how humanist citizenship reaches beyond the political and legal arenas to "challenge the way we view ourselves as members of communities and our responsibilities to these communities."⁴⁸

McDougall's presentation of the depth and breadth of humanity and human interaction that humanist citizenship theory works to encompass provides the researcher with a feel of the broad scope of theory, and a greater understanding of its overall purpose. Her work also shows the homeland security community how even such an intellectually and philosophically based concept as humanist citizenship theory does impact the political and legal realms. This is especially true in terms of providing a greater perspective through which policy decisions may be viewed.

The broad, all-encompassing, scope of humanist citizenship theory allows for a myriad of ideas to be put forth using its philosophical foundation as a platform because it calls for addressing obligations to all of humanity. In this

⁴⁵ McDougall, "Making the Impossible Possible...", 20.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 21–25.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 25.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 27.

context, it is possible to discuss topics such as “liberal empire”⁴⁹ and make a call for an American philosophy of citizenship. The liberal empire work, which states that the United States’ motives in promoting democracy around the world are imperial because it promotes only America’s form of democracy and none other,⁵⁰ presents humanist citizenship theory as one reason the United States should stop its liberal imperialism, since it tries to impose American-style democracy on the world. Similarly, the call for an American philosophy of citizenship that is not solely concerned with excluding foreigners, but which addresses the question of “Who do we want to be?”⁵¹ also fits into the humanist type of citizenship theory because it calls for an end to the exclusion of anyone on account of their being “alien.”

Thus, the all-of-humanity encompassing aspect of humanist citizenship theory provides a strong historical and philosophical foundation upon which arguments for changes in foreign as well as citizenship policy may be made, as long as the change would better humanity in some way. Humanist citizenship theory also provides a similar platform when an author is advocating an expansion of political activity beyond the confines of the nation-state and even beyond regional or continental borders.⁵² The growth of the power and influence of international law and nonterritorial based political entities⁵³ also finds a foundation in humanist citizenship theory. Once again, the expansive nature of humanist citizenship theory allows for a wide variety of political and legal topics to be incorporated into the discussion of citizenship.

⁴⁹ Barbara Arneil, “Global Citizenship and Empire,” *Citizenship Studies* 11, No. 3 (July 2007): 301-328, <http://ppkn.fkip.uns.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/globalcitizenship.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2011).

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Elizabeth F. Cohen, “Carved from the Inside Out: Immigration and America’s Public Philosophy of Citizenship,” in *Debating Immigration*, ed. Carol M. Swain, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 45.

⁵² Daniel Adler & Kim Rubenstein, “International Citizenship: The Future of Nationality in a Globalised World,” *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 7, issue 2 (April 1, 2000): 543, under “citizenship,” <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol7/iss2/4> (accessed March 17, 2011).

⁵³ Ibid., 545–546.

Of course, there are many works that serve as a rebuttal to either specific parts or the overall concept, of humanist citizenship and the reasons presented against humanist citizenship theory are as varied as those that use it as a foundational platform. One such is, "Cosmopolitan Citizenship: An Extension of Domestic Struggles for Political Equality?" by Peter Breiner. The main point Breiner sets out to make is that it seems unnecessary to look beyond the nation-state and national citizenship to achieve greater human rights and morality, since the possibility for such expansion still exists within their confines. This is because he does not see that the "historical struggle to expand citizenship and political equality that has accompanied most theories of democratic [nation-based] citizenship"⁵⁴ is yet complete and, that being the case, there is no need to move on to another form of citizenship just yet. Breiner thus views humanist types of citizenship theory as divorced from the real world when they ignore the historic struggles for democracy that are still ongoing at the national level and, by so doing, possibly undermining citizenship at both the humanist and national levels.⁵⁵

Jacob Levy, in his work, "Federalism, Liberalism, and the Separation of Loyalties" makes the argument that, "there can be uses, for liberal ends, of nonuniversalistic and nonrationally justifiable attachments, institutions, and formal inequalities."⁵⁶ While all such attachments, institutions and formal inequalities would not fulfill the aims of humanist citizenship theory, Levy argues that all such liberal principles need not be met in liberal institutions, such as federal-style nation-states, that allow laws and boundaries to be established which allow people to live in a moral manner within them.⁵⁷ Thus, Levy does not see the need for a purely humanist citizenship, or world order, to ensure liberal

⁵⁴ Breiner, "Cosmopolitan Citizenship" 1.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Jacob T. Levy, "Federalism, Liberalism, and the Separation of Loyalties," *The American Political Science Review* 101, No. 3 (August 2007): 474, under "citizenship" <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27644460> (accessed April 15, 2011).

⁵⁷ Ibid., 475.

principles are upheld but, rather, takes a more practical view that not every aspect of human life must be created with the highest principles in mind when the end goal is an organization, law, structure, etc., that will help humanity uphold those principles.

Samuel Huntington, in his work, *Who Are We?*⁵⁸ sees humanist, specifically cosmopolitanism, citizenship theory as an “attempt to reduce or to eliminate the social, political, and cultural differences between America and other societies.” This is considered a grave danger by Huntington, who sees one’s national identity as a vital part of a person’s psychological makeup, and who sees the American national identity as unique in the world and, thus, worthy of continued existence. Stanley Renshon’s, *The 50% American*,⁵⁹ takes a similar stance as Huntington, and will be discussed in detail later on in this thesis. Thus, there are those who use the chance to refute some part or all of the humanist type of citizenship theory as a platform to discuss everything from national identity to federalism to the unfinished business of guaranteeing human rights through democratic government.

As noted, while this review represents only a fraction of the works available on humanist citizenship theory, it is representative of the overall scope and diversity to be found therein, covering the basic tenets of the concept as well as providing a sample of the variety of perspectives that may be addressed under its umbrella. For the purposes of this thesis, humanist citizenship theory provides the researcher with the broadest theoretical work on citizenship to date and serves to remind one of the philosophical foundations of the concept, as well as those of the nation’s founding. It is important for the homeland security community to remember how the nation’s philosophical foundations, and the knowledge of them, may color the impressions people both within and outside of the United States may have of its methods and goals.

⁵⁸ Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2004), 364.

⁵⁹ Stanley A. Renshon, *The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005).

B. DIASPORA AND MULTICULTURALIST CITIZENSHIP THEORY: “GROUP RIGHTS”

The second type of citizenship theory literature in this review is diaspora (or “diasporic”) and multiculturalist (also called “cultural pluralism”) citizenship, which center on the idea that different groups within a political community be they based on ethnicity, race, religion, or nationality, should have their own collective voice in the governance of their place of residence. For the purposes of this review, diasporic, multicultural and cultural pluralist theories will be commonly referred to as “group rights.” The term “group rights” is meant here to emphasize that the basic premise of the theories discussed in this section is that groups or communities based on ethnicity, religion, nationality, or race must or should have a collective voice in their own governance and, therefore, rights as a collective entity. It must also be remembered that, as mentioned earlier, citizenship theories often contain overlapping bases, ideals, and goals. Group rights theories are no different in this regard. It should also be noted that many general discussions of citizenship theory incorporate calls for group rights and examples of these will be presented when they apply.

In comparison to humanist citizenship theory, group rights works, while still discussing philosophical and moral imperatives, tend to look to more practical reasons for their justification, as well as practical applications for their ideas. Group rights concerns are also often discussed as immigration concerns, especially the integration and/or assimilation of immigrant populations into their adopted society, and in the area of national identity and how it is formed, though most also address the need for such groups to have clear and relatively unencumbered access to citizenship in the same. Certain common threads run through the group rights works whether they are focused on immigration, citizenship or both. The following are not presented in any particular order:

- The exclusion of groups from having an active voice in the governance of democracies is counter to the claim of equal citizenship that serves as part of the foundation for most democratic nations.

- The importance to the social and psychological health and welfare of the group and its members that their culture and language be allowed to flourish in their new home.
- Group ties with their countries of origin are stronger than ever before due to the existing and growing ease in communications and transportation around the world so their greater and continued interaction with their countries of origin, up to and including dual or multiple citizenships must be expected and accepted.

Advocates of group rights citizenship theory see the above as necessary to ensure such groups are equal to all others in democratic nations, while also allowing them to fully enjoy the benefits of their own cultures and citizenship rights of their countries of origin.

Group rights citizenship theory shows its philosophical roots, and the common ground it shares with humanist theory, in its assertions that it is counter to the ideals of a democratic nation to exclude members of its population from active participation in their own governance.⁶⁰ Another similarity to humanist theory is the emphasis on promoting the individual and groups' responsibilities to humanity, based on both moral grounds and the need for justice for all.⁶¹ A further similarity may be seen when group rights citizenship theory or policies call for a greater recognition of, in this case, the multicultural nation's need for a global perspective about human rights, economics, and the environment,⁶² which echoes the humanist call for acknowledging and acting on humanity's obligations to one another and the world itself. Thus, while group rights citizenship theory has some themes and goals in common with humanist citizenship theory, the emphasis is still the achievement of those themes and goals through the group rights citizenship, instead of on an individual basis.

⁶⁰ T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer, eds. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*, (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002), 43.

⁶¹ Stephen Macedo, "The Moral Dilemma of U.S. Immigration Policy," in *Debating Immigration*, ed. Carol M. Swain, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 75.

⁶² "Globalization and Governance: Contemplating the Global Village," Report prepared by the Library of Parliament (Ottawa, Canada), December 2003, 19–20.

There is also an assumption in group rights citizenship theory that, most especially regarding ethnic minorities, a person who “feels secure in their own ethnic group identity will be more accepting and open toward [nongroup] members.”⁶³ This idea is found in discussions as diverse as those about the social nature of immigrant decisions to naturalize,⁶⁴ works addressing the continued growth of “sub-state national societies” who look to gain or regain some measures of self-government within existing nation-states,⁶⁵ and even the impact of the 7/7 attacks in London on multiculturalism in the United Kingdom.⁶⁶ How someone feels about their ethnic or cultural group, the role that basic culture plays in an individual’s life, and how that promotes one’s self-esteem, which then helps one be a productive member of society, is one of the key reasons group rights citizenship is seen as necessary in the diverse culture of a democratic nation. This ensures the individual is still viewed as a human being and worthy of respect on that basis alone, because the opposite means, “the reduction of individuals to a mere labor force leads to the withering of the human person as a political agent seeking self-rule and community.”⁶⁷

The role of an individual’s basic group identity—beyond the family, that is—is also considered to play an important role the formation, or lack thereof, of his or her national identity. Whether looking for a mathematical formula to find what national institution plays the most important role in shaping identity choice,

⁶³ Fathali M. Moghaddam, *Multiculturalism and Intergroup Relations: Psychological Implications for Democracy in Global Context*, (Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2008), 152.

⁶⁴ Irene Bloemraad, “Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada: Structured Mobilization and Immigrant Political Incorporation,” in *Social Forces*, 85, No. 2 (December 2006): 677–678.

⁶⁵ Stephen Tierney, “Reframing Sovereignty? Sub-State National Societies and Contemporary Challenges to the Nation-State,” *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 54, No. 1 (January 2005): 161–183, doi:10.1093/iclq/54.1.161

⁶⁶ Tariq Modood, “Remaking Multiculturalism after 7/7,” in *Open Democracy* (September 29, 2005): 3, under “citizenship,” <http://www.opendemocracy.net/content/articles/PDP/2879.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2011).

⁶⁷ Ban Wang, “Reimagining Political Community: Diaspora, Nation-State, and the Struggle for Recognition,” *Modern Drama* 48, No. 2 (Summer 2005): 253, under “citizenship,” http://muse.jhu/libproxy.nps.edu/journals/modern_drama/v048/48.2wang.pdf (accessed April 15, 2011).

as opposed to one's ethnicity,⁶⁸ or discussing how a national policy of multiculturalism, such as exists in Canada, should also allow for the existence of a "Canadian" ethnic category too, in order to further promote a Canadian national identity,⁶⁹ the individual's group identity is seen to play an important role in his or her integration into their "receiving nation," as countries that serve as destinations for mass migration are often known.

One work that looks at how a democratic nation should allow the cultures of different immigrant groups to transform its national identity is "Farewell to Multiculturalism? Sharing Values and Identities in Societies of Immigration,"⁷⁰ which sets out to rebut claims by critics of group rights, and multiculturalism specifically, who believe cohesion can be attained in nations with high numbers of immigrants based on shared democratic values and national identities by presenting a new "catalyst model of multiculturalism."⁷¹ The author calls for the shared identities of societies of immigration to be based on two new guidelines not previously stressed in group rights works. The first is that any shared identity should be seen as overarching and overlapping in nature rather than overriding. The second is that the shared identity of any nation should not be "fixed in their cultural and historical content but should be *self-transformative*,"⁷² and, thus, flexible and adaptable to the changing face of the nation as immigration continues.

⁶⁸ Elizabeth Maggie Penn, "Citizenship versus Ethnicity: The Role of Institutions in Shaping Identity Choice," in *The Journal of Politics*, Volume 70, Issue 04, 956–073, published by Southern Political Science Association (Statesboro, Georgia) accessed online via Google Scholar search at: https://penn.wustl.edu/Site/Washington_University_in_St._Louis/files/IDApp.pdf on April 13, 2011.

⁶⁹ Rhoda E. Howard-Hassmann, "'Canadian' as an Ethnic Category: Implications for Multiculturalism and National Unity," in *Canadian Public Policy – Analyse de Politiques*, Volume XXV, Number 4, 1999, 523–537, University of Toronto Press (Toronto, Canada).

⁷⁰ Rainer Bauböck, "Farewell to Multiculturalism? Sharing Values and Identities in Societies of Immigration." *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Volume 3, Number 1, Winter 2002, -1–16. The International Metropolis Project: Ottawa, Canada. Accessed online via Google Scholar search at: <http://www.springerlink.com> on February 9, 2011. (Note: this paper was first presented as a keynote speech at the panel "Diversity & Social Cohesion" at the Sixth International Metropolis Conference, November 26–30, 2001, Rotterdam, The Netherlands).

⁷¹ Bauböck, "Farewell to Multiculturalism?" 1.

⁷² Ibid., 13.

The most important point the author brings up is that conventional theories of multiculturalism are willing to expect that current nation-states will have to accept a “patchwork of diverse cultural practices” as normal without taking into account that the creation of the patchwork would mean changing the native population’s own national history from the whole cloth it is and transforming it into another piece in the patchwork. This blind spot in this version of group rights citizenship theory appears to overlook the work it would take to get the native population to re-imagine their history into the patchwork. It is better then, in the author’s opinion, to let the different cultures brought into a nation by immigrants start a process by which the native society transforms into something more pluralistic, with a more humanist rather than national outlook.

In the end, this work is an example of a citizenship theory that takes one-step-forward-while-keeping-one-foot-planted-in-place. The step forward is acknowledging that there is a native culture and it has just as much a right to exist as any of those of the immigrant populations. This is a step forward because there are works that ignore the native culture, especially if it was ever a colonial power. The foot-planted part is the oft-expressed group rights perspective that the native society must always be the one to transform and adapt. While it is understood that there will be change and transformation as a society evolves, transformation on demand, and without properly addressing legitimate national security concerns, would seem to be a recipe for creating more problems than solutions. For example, if citizenship rights were to be made available to any group that contained anti-American terrorist elements, criteria and processes would have to be created to exclude them, and that process is never done with ease or speed. Of course, the group rights advocates, such as

Janoski⁷³ and Bauböck⁷⁴ would say the native society always asks the immigrants to transform and adapt, so this is only fair. The question then becomes who has the greater obligation to adapt, those who did not choose to leave their country of origin, or those who did? Both sides may present strong arguments in their own favor and, thus, the debate continues. Still, the piece does serve to show how group rights citizenship theory addresses the quandary of how national identities are formed in nations full of diverse cultures.

Another common thread mentioned above looks at how immigrant populations are far more connected to, and have far greater continued interaction, with their countries of origin (also known as “sending nations”) than ever before. This is due to the rapid and continuing growth in communications, and the greater ease and relative low costs of international transportation, i.e., the Internet, cheap long distance and lower airfares. From Bloemraad⁷⁵ to Aleinikoff

⁷³ Thomas Janoski, “From Manifest Destiny to Multi-Cultural Diversity – The Causes of Naturalization Law in the United States, Australia, Canada and New Zealand,” (paper presented at the American Sociological Association Convention, Montreal, Canada, 2006) under “citizenship”
http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/0/4/7/9/pages104795/p104795-17.php (accessed March 22, 2011).

⁷⁴ Bauböck, “Farewell to Multiculturalism?” 4.

⁷⁵ Irene Bloemraad and Reed Ueda, “Naturalization and Nationality,” in *A Companion to American Immigration*, Reed Ueda, ed. (Maddan, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 52.

and Klusmeyer,⁷⁶ Rudolph⁷⁷ to Jedwab,⁷⁸ Renshon,⁷⁹ Alcántar,⁸⁰ Rubenstein⁸¹ and Mazzolari,⁸² the immigrant groups' ability on both individual and group levels to continue their active participation in their countries of origin is seen to be of vital importance, either in favor for, or against, group rights in the ongoing discussion over immigration and citizenship throughout the world.

Probably the most discussed and debated measure of an immigrant groups' interaction with their countries of origin is the acceptance or denial of dual citizenship status by both the sending and receiving nations. The pro-dual advocates see the status as providing stability to both the diaspora abroad and the sending nation at home.⁸³ Others contend dual citizenship is too divisive of an individual's loyalty,⁸⁴ and may be used by sending nations to try and unduly

⁷⁶ T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer, "Plural Nationality: Facing the Future in a Migratory World," *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, eds. (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), 71.

⁷⁷ Christopher Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," in *International Studies Review* 7, No. 1 (March 2005): 12, under "citizenship," <http://www.jstor.org> (accessed April 15, 2011).

⁷⁸ Jack Jedwab, "Dually Divided? The Risks of Linking Debates over Citizenship to Attachment to Canada," *International Journal* 63, No. 1, (Winter 2007/2008): 65–77, under "citizenship," <http://www.jstor.org> (accessed April 15, 2011).

⁷⁹ Stanley A. Renshon, "Dual Citizenship and American National Identity," Center for Immigration Studies (October 2001): 7, under "citizenship," <http://www.cis.org> (accessed January 18, 2011).

⁸⁰ Rocio Alcántar, "Dual Citizenship in the United States: Divided Loyalties or an Inevitable Consequence of a Globalized World?" DePaul University College of Law, 30, under "citizenship," http://www.law.depaul.edu/clinical_programs/ (accessed April 2, 2011).

⁸¹ Edwin S. Rubenstein, "Dual Citizenship Goes Global," *The Social Contract* 13, No. 3 (Spring 2003): 219, under "citizenship," http://www.thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/+sc/303/article_1147.shtml (accessed February 20, 2011).

⁸² Francesca Mazzolari, "Dual Citizenship Rights: Do They Make More and Richer Citizens?" *Demography* 46, No. 1 (February 2009): 169–191, under "citizenship," <http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/demography/v046/46.l.mazzolari.pdf> (accessed April 14, 2011).

⁸³ M. Marshall, "Dual Nationality Does Not Preclude Civic Loyalty, Martin Says," *Virginia Law* (November 1, 2004) under "dual citizenship," http://www.law.virginia.edu/html/news/2004_fall/martin.htm (accessed February 17, 2011).

⁸⁴ Stanley A. Renshon, *The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror*, (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 167–191.

influence a receiving nation's foreign policy in their favor.⁸⁵ Two examples, one pro and one con, of the dual citizenship debate will serve to provide an overview of the major points made throughout the mass of literature available on the subject, both within group rights theory and in general citizenship theory as well.

Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer provide an overview of the major reasons why dual and multiple citizenships (though, they use the term "nationality") should be accepted in their chapter titled, "Plural Nationality: Facing the Future in a Migratory World" of their book, *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*.⁸⁶ The authors begin by stating the seeming quandary that faces nation-states today, the fact that while dual citizenship was long denounced as an unviable splitting of an individual's loyalty to their nation, more and more nations have taken measures to legalize and promote the status among their populations.⁸⁷ They then move on to a study of how nations are dealing with dual citizenship, putting each country into one of three classifications being those open to the status, those tolerant of it and those who are restrictive about it based on a variety of factors. Some of the factors measured are:

For an 'open' designation (including Canada, France, Russia and the UK):

- Does the nation demand someone who gains dual citizenship through birth or blood ties to later choose between the two citizenships?
- Does the nation allow its citizens to naturalize elsewhere without renouncing their original citizenship?
- Are immigrants allowed to naturalize without renouncing their original citizenships?

For a 'tolerant' designation (including the United States, Australia, Germany, Israel, Mexico and South Africa):

⁸⁵ Stanley A. Renshon, *The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror*, (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 200–201.

⁸⁶ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, eds., *Citizenship Today*, 63–87.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.

- Dual citizenship achieved through jus soli (citizenship acquired by birth in a particular nation-state) is allowed without having to later choose between the two statuses.
- Citizens are allowed to obtain another citizenship without renunciation but those naturalizing must renounce their original citizenship to complete the process.
- Citizens who derive dual status through blood lines may have to choose between the two upon reaching adulthood.

For a 'restrictive' designation (including Austria and Japan):

- Jus soli acquisition of citizenship is restricted in order to restrict the acquisition of dual status.
- Immigrants choosing to naturalize must renounce their original citizenship to complete the process.
- If dual citizenship was acquired by birth in another nation, the individual must choose between the two statuses upon reaching adulthood."⁸⁸

Having established their criteria for which nations are pro, tolerant or against dual citizenship, the work turns to what it considers are the five main "real and imagined"⁸⁹ problems with the status, including: voting, holding public office, the "exit option" or being able to go to one's other nation if something goes wrong in the other, divided loyalty, and acquiring citizenship for convenience or to ease commercial interests. Voting involves two separate concerns. The first is that an individual will be able to vote in two countries, and the second is that the individual may vote for the interests of his or her sending nation in the elections of the receiving nation, neither of which are viewed as any great concern to the authors, though they go into little detail as to why.⁹⁰ Similarly, dual citizens who hold public office in one or the other of their nations of status is seen to have no more potential consequences than if that person held "influential positions in

⁸⁸ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, "Plural Nationality," 76–77.

⁸⁹ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, "Plural Nationality," 78.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 82.

large multinational corporations with business enterprises in the same [nations]...”⁹¹ The exit option, which may be seen as an unfair advantage over those who hold only a single citizenship, is considered, basically, overrated as to whether it should be a concern at all since it is not viewed as a main consideration for acquiring a second citizenship in the first place.⁹²

The question of loyalty and whether it is divisible between multiple nations or not, is considered the “heart of the matter,” as it is most often raised in opposition to dual citizenship status even if it may also be considered more symbolic than material in nature.⁹³ Loyalty to one’s nation has been considered of paramount concern throughout the historical period known as the Westphalian era. Considered to have started with the signing of the treaties bringing the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 that ended the Thirty Years’ War, the Westphalian era began the period in which nation-states have held sovereignty over specific territorial areas, and over the populations therein. Though the loyalty expected of a nation-state’s population has, over the years and in some places, changed from being subjects of a royal sovereign to a democratic government, the basic idea of being loyal to a single government remained the same. Loyalty to the nation-state served to guarantee the individual’s rights therein, provide protection to the individual when he or she traveled abroad and allowed the nation-state to know who was on its side in the frequent wars that once occurred. After World War II, and with the development of the United Nations came the beginning of an era working to guarantee human rights throughout the world and regardless of any particular nation-state. After the Cold War, and with it the lessening of having the world divided into two opposing ideological camps, the need to know whose side each person was on also diminished. This combination of changes: human rights on an international level, lessening division of the world into “us” vs. “them” after the Cold War, and growing globalization of economic productivity that calls

⁹¹ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, “Plural Nationality,” 78.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid., 83.

for greater movement of labor and resources, led many nations to reconsider the idea that each individual should have only a single loyalty and thus, citizenship to a single nation.

Now that these changes in the international arena have occurred, and are continuing, Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer see the main concern of loyalty as being a concern within each nation-state, rather than between them.⁹⁴ The new(er) internal problem is whether or not a dual citizen will fulfill his or her responsibilities within their nation of residence if they are also still participating in the society of their country of origin. Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer see this more as a problem with the institution of citizenship itself, rather than of an individual's loyalty in that the old idea, or ideal to some, of full, irrevocable, loyalty to a single nation-state, as the true meaning of citizenship simply does not reflect the realities of today's world.⁹⁵ Any decline in national commitment is seen as being a general occurrence, and not tied to the rise in dual citizenship status. Similarly, Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer do not see any evidence to support the fear that sending nations may be using dual citizens to try and affect change in the receiving nations' policies in their favor.⁹⁶ Thus, the so-called "heart of the matter," which was always considered to be a person's loyalty to a single nation-state under the Westphalian system, of dual citizenship is an unfounded concern in the present day.

Overall, Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer contend that there has been little adverse reaction to the growing phenomenon of dual citizenship because most of the arguments are based on concepts grounded in historical circumstances that no longer exist on an appreciable scale, or on fears for which there is little evidence for their basis. While unwilling to make any concrete predictions for the future of dual citizenship, they believe the future will bring "a world that remains

⁹⁴ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, "Plural Nationality," 83.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 84.

⁹⁶ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, "Plural Nationality," 84.

relatively tolerant of dual nationality.”⁹⁷ The overall summation of the pro side of the debate about dual and multiple citizenships this work presents covers all the salient points covered by both sides of the ongoing debate, without falling into the trap of overstatement simply to make their point.

Directly opposed in opinion about dual citizenship to Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer is *The 50% American* by Stanley Renshon. But, along with outlining his reasons why dual citizenship should not be allowed let alone encouraged,⁹⁸ Renshon also addresses the topics of what makes up the American national identity,⁹⁹ the challenges to that identity presented by multiculturalism and transnationalism,¹⁰⁰ along with making proposals as to how the United States should deal with dual citizenship,¹⁰¹ in particular, and citizenship¹⁰² in general. Broad in scope, the work stands as a rebuttal of most all the denationalized forms of citizenship theory to be found in the current literature.

The main arguments Renshon makes against dual citizenship cover the spectrum from psychology to national security, and most everything in between. The psychological implications for ever greater numbers of identities per individual, including loyalty to more than one nation through dual citizenship, are that the multiculturalists ignore the fact that each identity must be substantial and significant if it is to help sustain the individual’s psychological health. Too many identities built on every shallower attachment, as would be the case in dual citizens, have the potential to cause more harm than good. Renshon refutes the idea that “core identity elements are infinitely malleable” and that “all identifications have equal weight”¹⁰³ on the basis that it “fails to distinguish

⁹⁷ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, “Plural Nationality,” 87.

⁹⁸ Stanley A. Renshon, *The 50% American*, 1–38.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 39–80.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 81–126.

¹⁰¹ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 192–219.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 220–250.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* Renshon, *The 50% American*, 146.

between the elements of the personal identity that form a central core of one's psychology and those that are more peripheral." National identity is a core identity formed from a very young age to Renshon and, therefore, not something to be easily duplicated later in life or a number of times. Furthermore, all such identities would not automatically be equal.¹⁰⁴

The need for any democracy to have a knowledgeable, active and engaged citizenry is also central to Renshon's argument, especially with the new emphasis on national security after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. He argues that the emphasis by humanists and advocates of group rights on the need for American children to be educated more and more about the world, and less about their own nation¹⁰⁵ and its ideals, is not only detrimental to the continued viability of democracy in the United States, but it also may cause a lessening of cultural stability¹⁰⁶ in the United States as well. Without an informed and engaged citizenry to help with the nation's security and provide a stable culture in which immigrants may be integrated, the United States may not survive in its current form. Dual citizenship may worsen the situation by adding to the number of U.S. citizens who do not fully participate in the nation's governance, and who feel a cultural conflict due to their continued active attachment to their countries of origin.¹⁰⁷

Renshon expands his discussion of the cultural conflict that dual citizenship may produce to include the possibility of political conflict as well.¹⁰⁸ Using Mexico as his prime example, Renshon emphasizes how the rise in dual citizenship has not only mostly been among immigrant-sending nations, but that it is generally done with those nations' self-interests in mind, as much as the

¹⁰⁴ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 146–147.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 151.

¹⁰⁶ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 153.

¹⁰⁷ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 154.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 170.

individual immigrant's.¹⁰⁹ All of which begs the question, from Renshon's perspective at least, of what advantage is dual citizenship to the receiving nation, if any? Renshon does not answer that question, he simply goes on to note that it is just as possible for the pull dual citizens feel from their countries of origin to prove stronger than their attachment to their receiving nation, as it would for it to be the other way around or, for that original attachment to simply make an individual feel ambivalent to the nation of their secondary citizenship.¹¹⁰

Given Renshon's arguments against the possible advantages of dual citizenship to the United States, his proposals for "reforming"¹¹¹ it should come as no surprise and are paraphrased as follows:

1. Discourage U.S. citizens from voting in foreign elections.¹¹²
2. Dissuade U.S. citizens from seeking or serving in elective or appointive offices abroad.¹¹³
3. Dissuade U.S. citizens from seeking to serve in foreign military service of any kind.¹¹⁴
4. U.S. citizens serving in elective or appointive office in the United States should not hold dual citizenship or take part in foreign elections or have any ties with foreign governments while so doing.¹¹⁵

Renshon goes on to make recommendations for ways to further or continue the development of America's national identity which are paraphrased as follows:

¹⁰⁹ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 171.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 178.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 192.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 196.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 203–204.

¹¹⁴ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 207.

¹¹⁵ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 208–209.

1. Federal, state and local governments should establish and maintain immigrant welcome centers throughout the U.S. to help with immigrant integration into American society.¹¹⁶
2. Federal, state and local government should take steps to help immigrant acquire or improve their English skills free of charge.¹¹⁷
3. English should be made the language of professional and public affairs throughout the U.S. as much as possible.¹¹⁸
4. Schools need to provide “realistic knowledge” of America’s history, way of life, people, institutions, and people including what still needs to be done within our nation in order to prepare future generations for lives as informed and engaged citizens.¹¹⁹
5. Noncitizens should not be allowed to vote in national, state or local elections though provisions should be made for noncitizen parents with school-age children to be able to vote in school board elections.¹²⁰
6. All efforts should be made to discourage illegal immigration, including the application of pressure on foreign nations to help stem the flow.¹²¹

Renshon concludes that there is no easy answer to the situation the United States now faces when it comes to answering the question of how to ensure there is a continued sense of community and national identity amongst its citizens. This situation includes high levels of illegal immigration, the growing number of immigrants—legal and illegal—with dual citizenship and the pressures that places on that part of the population, and the lack of education about American history and culture in its schools as articulated in his work but, he also feels it is perhaps “the most important domestic national issue facing this country”¹²² in light of the age of terrorism and the danger it poses to the nation.

¹¹⁶ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 224–225.

¹¹⁷ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 226.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 228–229.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 231.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 233–234.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 235–236.

¹²² Renshon, *The 50% American*, 251–253.

Renshon's work, though presented here as a refutation of dual citizenship, is actually a refutation of most of the citizenship theories that call for an expansion of the concept beyond the limits of the nation-state. As such it serves to remind the reader of the practical concerns of citizenship within the nation-state where it does, in fact, now exist and sparks interest in a reconsideration of the different types of citizenship theory from a how-to-use-it-now perspective. One does not have to agree fully or partially with Renshon to gain from the practical perspective he presents.

This review covers just a sample of the scope of literature available on group rights citizenship theory while still presenting the major concerns for group rights advocates: continued attachment to one's original cultural roots, and continued interaction and involvement with one's country of origin, including dual citizenship. For, at its essence, group rights citizenship theory is all about the achievement of citizenship rights for ethnic, cultural, religious, etc., groups as a whole, and for the individuals in those groups based on their group membership. The homeland security community should be very interested in group rights citizenship theories as a source of insight into the very communities within the nation it must work with on their integration into our society and to prevent the radicalization of any of their members as well.

C. POSTNATIONAL AND TRANSNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP THEORY

The third category of citizenship theory in this review is postnational and transnational. The grouping together of these two types by this author is done because both postnational and transnational, in their current forms, are often tied to or considered mainly to be caused by the affects of globalization¹²³ on the world. Post and transnational citizenship focus on the idea that the nation-state, the historic source of citizenship recognized since the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, is no longer, and need no longer, be the sole or even main source of

¹²³ Tony Evans, "Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization," *Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance* 25, No. 4 (2000) under "citizenship," <http://find.galegroup.com/gps/> (accessed April 1, 2011).

citizenship. This is usually based on the fact that many of the rights and privileges of citizenship, most especially social benefits such as welfare, housing, etc., are no longer tied to one's citizenship status in many nations.¹²⁴ The argument continues on, saying that since there are so few differences between citizens and noncitizens now, there are few, if any, reasons not to just give the full rights of citizenship to those living in a nation after only a few criteria are met.¹²⁵ If this sounds familiar, it is because it echoes the same call often made in humanist and group rights citizenship theory as well.

Other citizenship sources or, at least potential sources, recognized in post and transnational theory include supranational¹²⁶ or regional¹²⁷ (i.e., the European Union), sub-state¹²⁸ (i.e., Scotland's limited self-government within the United Kingdom), as well as the possibility of eventual globally-based citizenship. Post and transnational theories also often discuss diasporic¹²⁹ and other group rights-based citizenships too, as well as delving into the realm of humanist theory with discussions of both the philosophical and moral reasons for expanding citizenship beyond the nation-state and the obligation of individuals to all of humanity.¹³⁰ Discussions about post and transnational citizenship also include

¹²⁴ David Abraham, "Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism: On the Decline of National Citizenship in the U.S., Germany, and Israel." The Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, San Diego, Working Paper 53 (May 2002): 18, under "citizenship," <http://www.ccis-hcsd.org> (accessed November 30, 2010).

¹²⁵ T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer, eds. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002): 8.

¹²⁶ Rainer Bauböck, "Citizenship and National Identities in the European Union [1]," Working Paper, The Jean Monnet Center for International and Regional Economic Law and Justice, The NYU Institutes on the Park (1997), under "citizenship," <http://centers.law.nyu.edu/jeanmonnet/papers/97/97-04--4.html> (accessed February 17, 2011).

¹²⁷ Monica W. Varsanyi, "Rescaling the 'Alien,' Rescaling Personhood: Neoliberalism, Immigration and the State," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98, No. 4 (2008): 877-896, under "citizenship," <http://content.ebscohost.com.libproxy.nps.edu/> (accessed April 15, 2011).

¹²⁸ Stephen Tierney, "Reframing Sovereignty? Sub-State National Societies and Contemporary Challenges to the Nation-State," 161-183.

¹²⁹ David Abraham, "Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism."

¹³⁰ Ruth Lister, "Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential," *Citizenship Studies* 11, No. 1 (2007): 49-61, under "citizenship," <http://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/> (accessed April 13, 2011).

those who say the nation-state and national citizenship are not down and out for the count just yet.¹³¹ These will be discussed at the end of this section.

Post and transnational citizenship theory, as noted above, are generally tied to globalization and its effects on migration, communications, economics, resource allocation, etc. A decent general definition for globalization that will serve for the purposes of this review is found on the Levin Institute's "Globalization 101" website and states:

Globalization is a process of interaction and integration among the people, companies, and governments of different nations, a process driven by international trade and investment and aided by information technology. This process has effects on the environment, on culture, on political systems, on economic development and prosperity, and on human physical well-being in societies around the world.¹³²

More specifically, post and transnational citizenship theory often emphasizes how the sovereignty of the nation-state is being displaced, changed, or even replaced as the basis for citizenship. This change in sovereignty is seen as being made or pushed by international law that guarantees human rights,¹³³ regional organizations¹³⁴ that include agreements on labor migration as well as funds, resources and means of production, and when partial sovereignty¹³⁵ is claimed within a nation-state. Other works concentrate on the impact of the

¹³¹ Keith J. Bybee, ed., "Editor's Note," "Citizenship at Home and Abroad," *International Studies Review* 7 (2005): 504–505, under "citizenship," <http://www.jstor.org> (accessed April 15, 2011).

¹³² The Levin Institute, under "globalization," http://www.globalization101.org/What_is_Globalization.html (accessed November 4, 2011).

¹³³ "Globalization and Governance: Contemplating the Global Village," Report prepared by the Library of Parliament (Ottawa, Canada), December 2003, 16.

¹³⁴ Adler and Rubenstein, "International Citizenship: The Future of Nationality in a Globalised World," 526–527.

¹³⁵ Melissa S. Williams, "On Peoples and Constitutions, Sovereignty and Citizenship," (paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, 2004): 4, under "citizenship," <http://apsa.net> (accessed March 3, 2011).

economic aspects of globalization on the authority of the nation-state, and on how the language of human rights is now being used to promote ever greater expansion of economic globalization.¹³⁶

An example of a work with economic globalization as one of its main themes for the lessening in importance of national citizenship is David Abraham's "Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism: On the Decline of National Citizenship in the United States, Germany, and Israel."¹³⁷ Abraham discusses how immigrants to democratic nations have benefited legally by growth in "individual equal protection and legal proportionality doctrines"¹³⁸ that have helped to balance the alien and immigrants' legal protections in most Western democracies. This trend is considered to have created a "rights culture, one which is overwhelming Universalist and individualist."¹³⁹ This movement toward the inclusion of aliens and immigrants into the society, at least as far as legal rights are concerned, is also seen as having:

weakened the content of citizenship, lessened the disabilities faced by resident noncitizens, reduced the level of solidarity in the respective societies, and made life less onerous for those who may be construed or constructed as minorities. (Emphasis in original)¹⁴⁰

The consequence of this is seen as having undermined national citizenship in the three nations Abraham discusses, the United States, Germany and Israel, to such an extent as to have little impact on new immigrants whose ties to their countries of origin are stronger than ever. Abraham then ties the reasons for the lessening importance of national citizenship in each of the three

¹³⁶ Tony Evans, "Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization," 1.

¹³⁷ David Abraham, "Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism."

¹³⁸ Ibid., 13.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 14.

¹⁴⁰ David Abraham, "Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism, 16.

countries to the neo-liberal (globalized) economic trends that started after World War II and took a strong hold on world trade after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989.

While many of the arguments Abraham presents have been put forth by others before, Abraham is one of the few academics who are willing to unequivocally tie changes in legal status to the economics of globalization to provide a new perspective on the problem. Abraham also provides an excellent summation of why neo-liberal economics gained so much ground after the fall of the Soviet Union when he said the fall of the Soviet Union removed the perceived need “to engage in social and economic redistribution, or even foreign aid, as an insurance policy against potential sympathy for Communism.”¹⁴¹ Overall, Abraham’s work combines the major post and transnational citizenship themes of globalization, economics, and the more recent universal nature of human rights law even within nation-states and the lessening of the importance of national citizenship.

“International Citizenship: The Future of Nationality in a Globalised World” also covers many of the major themes of post and transnational citizenship theory in its attempt to see what may become of nationality when sovereignty is challenged by globalization.¹⁴² “Nationality,” as used in this work, equals the same concept as citizenship, namely, the “technical legal relationship between the individual and the polity” but in the forum of international law instead of in domestic law.¹⁴³ This distinction sets the stage for the works’ discussion of the affects of globalization,¹⁴⁴ both in terms of transnational organizations that control

¹⁴¹ Adler and Rubenstein, “International Citizenship,” 21.

¹⁴² Ibid., 519.

¹⁴³ Adler and Rubenstein, “International Citizenship,” 521.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 526–527.

commerce¹⁴⁵ and in terms of interconnectedness through the Internet and other cheaper international communications,¹⁴⁶ and supra-national institutions on nationality.¹⁴⁷

Globalization is seen to have been a cause of the gradual lessening in international law's stand against dual citizenship in that the number of people with dual status has risen on account of globalization's mass migration, and international law has become more flexible in response to the same.¹⁴⁸ The greater role of international law, on subjects like dual citizenship is also seen as lessening the sovereignty of the nation-state, since it recognizes the rights of a single individual to belong to more than one nation-state and, thus, similarly, lessens the value of nationality.¹⁴⁹ From here, the work looks at four cases of international law, two of which concern human rights and two that involve a conflict between two nation-states over the nationality of an individual, known as "standing"¹⁵⁰ cases. The two standing cases are used as examples of how international legal consideration of nationality now allows dual citizens to make claims against either of their citizenship-holding nation-states when, historically, one citizenship was always found to be dominant. The two human rights cases involve situations where an individual claimed rights normally agreed to be part of one's nationality—i.e., continuation of residence, ability to stay with one's family, etc.—because of lifelong residence in a nation even though neither had, technically, completed all the formal requirements for nationality. All four cases are presented to show "tensions in the functionality of the formal status of nationality in international law"¹⁵¹ in order to highlight the need for the law to be

¹⁴⁵ Adler and Rubenstein, "International Citizenship," 52–528.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 528.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 529.

¹⁴⁸ Adler and Rubenstein, "International Citizenship," 533.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 534.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 534–538.

¹⁵¹ Adler and Rubenstein, "International Citizenship," 538–543.

“refashioned in the future”¹⁵² in order to accommodate the changes in the scope of nationality now being accepted in the international forum.

Adler and Rubenstein then present their predictions for what may happen in international law if the current trend, as shown in the legal cases discussed, of expanding the meaning of nationality beyond the single nation-state and its relationship to an individual continues, which are:

1. An increasing willingness in international treaty law to acknowledge and encourage dual and multiple nationality.
2. A dilution of the centrality of allegiance and the consequences of nationality in domestic and international case law.
3. A movement away from the centrality of the state in international law.¹⁵³

Adler and Rubenstein conclude that this trend in international law is toward a more effective notion of nationality than what now exists in historical international legal precedent, which may allow for an individual’s participation in non-nation-based communities such as supranational, regional or even nonterritorial.¹⁵⁴ And, though the terminology may be slightly different, they are also presenting their reasons for how citizenship may function in a post or transnational world. Overall, this work provides the reader with a better understanding of the international legal aspect of post and transnational citizenship theory, without losing them in legalese and while still tying the information neatly back into basic post and transnational theory.

Post and transnational citizenship theory sets out to show how a variety of factors beyond the control of the nation-state, such as globalization, the rise in dual citizenship and the shrinking of differences between immigrants and citizens, call for a citizenship that also moves beyond the nation-state. It is also one of the more difficult categories to define in that “postnational” could also be

¹⁵² Adler and Rubenstein, “International Citizenship,” 543.

¹⁵³ Adler and Rubenstein, “International Citizenship,” 545–546.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 546.

used to describe all the other citizenship theories that also call for the concept of citizenship to move beyond the nation-state, be it on a global level or to include group rights. The importance of this theoretical material to the homeland security community should serve as a reminder of the international aspect of its work, and how the global interconnectivity of the world's population makes everything it does have an impact on the world's perspective of its efforts.

"In this brief analysis of a vast terrain,"¹⁵⁵ to borrow a phrase, the major types of citizenship theories have been presented to provide as complete an overview as possible in the limitations of this thesis. The works on global and cosmopolitan ("humanist") citizenship theory show the philosophical and idealistic foundations and aspirations for a citizenship in which each individual is fully committed to their obligations to all of humanity. Diaspora and multiculturalist ("group rights") citizenship focuses on the important role an individual's basic group identity, or identities, beyond the family unit play in their lives, and call for citizenship rights based on those core group identities. Post and transnational citizenship theories could be said to encompass all the rest and still focus on the affects of globalization on the world's populations and how those affects should be translated into citizenship of similar scope. The next task, after explaining the methodology involved, is to analyze and synthesize the information gleaned from the review, and further research to show what may be relevant to the homeland security community and its work.

¹⁵⁵ Anthony Smith, "'Set in the Silver Sea': English National Identity and European Integration," (paper for the Centre for the Study of Democratic Government, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, May 2005): 10, under "integration," http://oxpo.politics.ox.ac.uk/materials/national_identity/Smith_Paper.pdf (accessed April 13, 2011).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

III. METHODOLOGY

A. METHOD, ADAPTATIONS, AND REASONS FOR THE SAME

Research for this thesis used an adaptation of the methodology called “Qualitative Research Synthesis,”¹⁵⁶ with the main adaptation being: The synthesis involved papers, articles, reports, etc., about different aspects of a single subject, citizenship, but which were not specific qualitative research studies involving focus groups, or survey answers, such as those discussed by the authors of the work. The main objective of the synthesis was to discover and show those parts of the many citizenship theories analyzed relevant to the homeland security enterprise. This is a variation on the main goal of qualitative research synthesis, as set forth by the authors, in that, instead of trying to discover aspects of the original subject of the works discussed that may have been left undiscovered or discussed when the work was originally produced, this work reexamines the works involved in the synthesis from a completely different perspective, with an eye toward their relevance to same, namely, homeland security. Finally, the synthesis presented in this thesis has been completed by the author alone, instead of stemming from the group research analysis as discussed in the original methodology.

Qualitative research synthesis was chosen as the method by which to work on this thesis for a number of reasons. First, was its focus on qualitative works as a viable basis for further research without resorting to quantitative evaluation.¹⁵⁷ Second, qualitative research synthesis allows for the reinvestigation of existing qualitative works, in order to discover what was not found during the original research¹⁵⁸ the work was based on and, while this thesis is not revisiting the various works on citizenship theory to add to

¹⁵⁶ Claire Howell Major and Maggi Savin-Baden, *Introduction to Qualitative Research Synthesis* (London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2010).

¹⁵⁷ Major and Savin-Baden, *Qualitative Research Synthesis*, 13.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

citizenship theory itself, it does look to discover aspects of the synthesized works not discussed up to now. The variation being, of course, that the synthesis is being performed to find the relevance of the works on citizenship theory to homeland security and not just to citizenship theory and nothing in qualitative research synthesis appeared to preclude its use for such a purpose either. Third, unlike meta-synthesis, there is little emphasis on the quantity¹⁵⁹ of qualitative works considered necessary to complete the synthesis. This worked well with the time constraints of this master's program. This work also provided excellent information on how to define online searches to gather the works to be analyzed and synthesized.¹⁶⁰ Qualitative research synthesis also provided guidance on how to take the information gleaned from the initial reading of a work and then analyze and interpret it to use in the overall synthesis with its imagery of analysis, synthesis and interpretation as interlocking gears¹⁶¹ in the overall methodology machine. Further adaptations made within specific steps of the methodology will be described in the discussion of the individual step below.

B. QUALITATIVE RESEARCH SYNTHESIS: THE STEP-BY-STEP PROCESS AND ADAPTATIONS THEREOF

Qualitative research synthesis contains the following six basic steps:

1. Identify studies related to a research question
2. Collate qualitative studies across a large area of literature
3. Examine the theories and methods used in each study in length
4. Compare and analyze findings for each study
5. Synthesize findings for each study
6. Undertake an interpretation of findings across the studies

¹⁵⁹ Major and Savin-Baden, *Qualitative Research Synthesis*, 15.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 48–51.

¹⁶¹ Major and Savin-Baden, *Qualitative Research Synthesis*, 71.

7. Present an interpretive narrative about the synthesis of findings
8. Provide a series of recommendations¹⁶²

Step 1, the identification of the various works used in this thesis involved searches conducted online. Search engines and websites used included Google™ search, Google™ Scholar search, the Social Science Resource Network (SSRN®) and the American Political Science Association's (APSA®) website. Other databases were accessed through the Naval Postgraduate School's Dudley Knox Library and included: JSTOR®, Project Muse®, EBSCO®, ProQuest®, WorldCat® and in the Homeland Security Digital Library. Relevant terms were chosen in an effort to identify works on citizenship theory that also addressed aspects of citizenship relevant to homeland security. This included searches for the word "citizenship" and the use of the modifiers (alone or in combination) "American," "loyalty," "allegiance," "patriotism," "civic duty," and "integration".

Most of the modifiers were chosen because they represent aspects of citizenship represented in the national-level homeland security strategies, which this researcher interprets as calling for actions based on a citizen's "loyalty" and "allegiance" to the nation as well as their feelings of "patriotism" and an attempt to invoke the responsibility of being a citizen in the form of "civic duty" to the nation as a whole. "Integration" and "dual citizenship" were also added to the list and used in some searches in order to find works that would address the main assumptions set forth in the four scenarios outlined in the introduction to this work. As may be recalled from the introduction scenarios, "the Loyalty Oath," which involves an individual with the United States and Pakistani citizenship, covers the obvious modifiers "loyalty" and "dual citizenship," but may also be seen as concerned with all the rest of the modifiers too. After all, one would assume Mr. Khan had "integrated" into American society on a certain level to

¹⁶² Major and Savin-Baden, *Qualitative Research Synthesis*, 11.

want to work for the FBI, which is a form of doing his “civic duty,” showing his “allegiance” and, perhaps, even his level of “patriotism.”

The question of “integration” is apparent in “The Rescue,” where U.S. citizens were no longer even living in the United States; in “Basic English?” where the U.S. citizen couple would not speak English; and in “Security Problem?” where there was a possibility of a U.S. citizens working with, supporting, or even being a terrorist. Levels of these U.S. citizens “allegiance,” “loyalty,” and “patriotism” are also a matter of concern in those three scenarios. Searches were further modified to keep the results focused on overall citizenship by subtracting terms such as “gender,” “sexual,” “education,” “religion,” and most nation-specific studies, though a few that got past the modifiers made the final cut into the synthesis. These terms were used to subtract from the number of studies chosen in an attempt to cover the broader bases of citizenship theory, and because most describe works calling for citizenship based on a particular group characteristic, which was already being covered in the diaspora and multicultural (“group rights”) works already found in the basic searches.

In Step 2, the studies, articles, reports, etc., were then collated, not based on the criteria of their comparability and compatibility, as suggested in qualitative research synthesis, but, rather, on whether or not they discussed the overall topic, citizenship, in a manner that included some definition, discussion, information, opinion and/or proposal that either presented or added to the different types of theory on the topic or, in so doing, touched specifically on one of the modifiers. This helped to include more types of citizenship theory than would have otherwise been considered in the research, and allowed the body of literature included in the thesis to better represent the unique scope of ideas, secondary subjects and variations that are now considered to be about citizenship.

Steps 3 and 4 of the qualitative research synthesis were not considered relevant to this thesis. This is due to the fact that the synthesis was not done for the purpose of either judging the quality of the works included, or of their findings

but, rather, to glean what they contained of importance and relevance to homeland security. This does not presume the quality of the works in the synthesis; instead it simply accepts them as published academic and think tank works representing the types of citizenship theory, and the discussion and debate about them at this time.

The synthesis of the research findings has been done in an effort to provide two things: first, a basic understanding of the overarching concepts found within the breadth and depth of citizenship theories through synthesis of common factors found therein and, second, to bring forth the themes relevant to homeland security that are also there. This exercise incorporates Steps 5, 6 and 7, as the interpretation of the findings entails the discovery of those elements relevant to homeland security and presented in a narrative form.

Finally, and encompassing the final Step 8 of the qualitative research synthesis, recommendations will be presented for consideration by the homeland security community, as well as for possible further research into the area of citizenship theory and its relevance to the homeland security community.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. SYNTHESIS

Citizenship is definitely a topic of great interest right now in the academic world, based on the sheer number of works available, with new voices jumping into the fray every day. The types of citizenship of most interest are not those based on the two usual ways of acquiring citizenship, *jus soli* (“of the land” meaning citizenship is acquired by birth in the territory of a nation-state) or *jus sanguinis* (“of the blood” meaning citizenship is acquired through family [blood] relationship within a nation-state), which are both bound to a particular nation-state. No, citizenship is seen as having, should have, or will be, broken free of the nation-state boundaries, and is now discussed as being “global,”¹⁶³ “transnational,”¹⁶⁴ “postnational,”¹⁶⁵ “cosmopolitan,”¹⁶⁶ “cosmo-political,”¹⁶⁷ “international,”¹⁶⁸ “multicultural,”¹⁶⁹ “diaspora,”¹⁷⁰ “denationalized,”¹⁷¹ even “environmental,”¹⁷² and now involve practically everything from one’s ethnicity and politics to their social agenda and views on morality.

¹⁶³ Heather McDougall, “Making the Impossible Possible: Global Citizenship in Morality, Education, and Practice.”

¹⁶⁴ Melissa S. Williams, “On Peoples and Constitutions, Sovereignty and Citizenship,” 7.

¹⁶⁵ Peter H. Schuck, “Citizenship in a Post-9/11 World: An Exchange Between Peter H. Schuck and David A. Cole – The Meaning of American Citizenship in a Post-9/11 World,” *Fordham Law Review* 75 (2006-2007): 2536, under “citizenship” <http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu> (accessed April 7, 2011).

¹⁶⁶ Martha Nussbaum, “Kant and Cosmopolitanism.”

¹⁶⁷ Raffaele Marchetti, “Toward a World Migratory Regime,” *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 15, Issue 2 (Summer 2008): 472, under “citizenship” http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v015/15.2.marc_hetti.pdf (accessed April 14, 2011).

¹⁶⁸ Adler and Rubenstein, “International Citizenship.”

¹⁶⁹ Will Kymlicka, “Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue canadienne de science politique* 43, No. 2 (June 2010) under “citizenship,” http://www.soc.aau.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/Kbm/Vof/kurson/2011/Multiculturalism/Will_Kymlicka_testing_the_liberal_multiculturalist.pdf (accessed April 19, 2011).

¹⁷⁰ Williams, “On Peoples and Constitutions,” 7.

¹⁷¹ Bosniak, “Citizenship Denationalized,” 454.

¹⁷² Williams, “On Peoples and Constitutions,” 7.

All of this extrapolation, or expansion, as it were, of the concept of citizenship beyond the nation-state raises a myriad of questions for anyone working for a *national* government. This is mainly due to the rather glaring lack of governmental entities above the national level that would administer the transnational, global, etc., forms of citizenship discussed. Beyond that point, which is unanswerable at this time, and for the purposes of this thesis, the question then becomes, “What aspects of the types of citizenship theory presented are relevant to the homeland security community?”

As presented in the four scenarios in the Introduction, a person’s citizenship does impact interactions with the homeland security community. The debate on dual citizenship that plays such an important role in group rights and post/transnational citizenship theory, lies at the core of the situation in “the Loyalty Oath” which also shows how one U.S. government agency has already moved to address it. Dual citizenship, continued and ever closer interaction with countries of origin and U.S. citizens who choose to return to their countries of origin, all play a part in “the Rescue” and all lend a hand to the complexity of the situation. All of which touches on elements of post/transnational, group rights and, specifically in regards to how the U.S. government addresses the needs of the non-U.S. citizens in the scenario, humanist citizenship theory concerns as well. Just how much integration is occurring, or should be, among immigrants, how much naturalized citizens participate in American society, and motivations for naturalization are all brought into question in “Basic English?” All of which, once again, touches on post/transnational, group rights and possibly, humanist citizenship theory. “Security Problem?” also brings up questions about integration and, possibly, motivation for naturalization, as well as concerns for general attachment to the United States that, hopefully, should counteract terrorist attempts to radicalize U.S. citizens against their own nation. Again, bringing up aspects of all the types of citizenship theory discussed thus far, and all of which makes citizenship, what it means, who has it and in what form, of vital concern to the homeland security enterprise.

What follows is a synthesis of the types of citizenship theory with emphasis on those -). For the purposes herein, the various citizenship theories will be grouped as they were for the literature review:

1. “Humanist”: Those based on a moral imperative or the moral obligation of each individual to humanity as a whole, which includes:

- Global
- Cosmopolitan
- Cosmo-political

2. “Group rights”: Those promoting group rights to citizenship whether bound to a specific territory or not:

- Diasporic
- Multicultural

3. “Post and Transnational”: Those based mostly in the effects of globalization:

- Postnational
- Transnational

4. Those with specific political, ideological or subject agendas and calling for the recognition of the groups, or the membership, that advocate each as a basis for citizenship rights:

- Environmental
- Gender
- Sexual Orientation
- Animal Rights, etc.

As noted earlier, this thesis will not address the fourth “agenda” category as many of the rights they seek as groups are covered under “group rights”

category. Likewise, “denationalized” denotes all types of citizenship theory that involve separating the concept of citizenship from its ties to the nation-state and, hence, “denationalizes” citizenship.¹⁷³

Humanist citizenship theory has actually been around for a very long time, as noted by the famous “I am a citizen of the world” quotes of Socrates, Diogenes, and Einstein but, the question has also always been asked as to what they meant. In its simplest form, humanist citizenship is when a person acknowledges and bases their actions on their place in the whole of humanity, without prejudice or distinction on account of his or her particular race, religion, ethnicity, political beliefs, etc. Humanism, as a theory of citizenship, takes the further step to call for action to achieve Diogenes’ philosophy throughout the world, through taking actions to fulfill one’s obligation to all of humanity. This emphasis on the individual, his or her perspective and his or her actions based on that perspective, make humanism the most introspective, and least likely to involve governmental input of the all the different types of citizenship theory.

One of the most commonly used illustrations of humanist citizenship theory, which is specifically cosmopolitan, is Diogenes’ concentric circles.¹⁷⁴ Just as a stone dropped into a pond sends out concentric circles from its point of entry into the water, each identity of a human being, starting with the individual self, forms a concentric circle around the next such as: self, family, work, religion, ethnicity, etc. While each circle envelopes the last, they are not considered to interfere or constrain the preceding identities. The final circle, final for now as life has yet to be found on other planets, is the one encompassing the whole of humanity, though, the term cosmopolitan certainly allows for embracing the cosmos, if and when that ever becomes a reality. Humanist citizenship theorists see national citizenship as only one circle in an individual’s identity and, since it is not the outermost, of relative unimportance in the greater scheme of things. -

¹⁷³ Bosniak, “Citizenship Denationalized,” 454.

¹⁷⁴ Martha Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” *Boston Review* XIX, No. 5 (October/November 1994): 3, under “patriotism” <http://bostonreview.net/BR19.5/nussbaum.php> (accessed April 19, 2011).

all humanity as one's equals, and as deserving of the same rights and privileges as the citizens of any particular nation-state. The present day is seen as ripe, by its advocates, for this philosophy and theory to flourish on account of the greater interconnectivity of all peoples through the Internet and social media, and other effects of globalization, which are seen to be bringing the world closer and closer together.¹⁷⁵ One of the main arguments for this theory is that there is no morally acceptable basis on which any entity/group/ gathering/etc., either national, political, racial, ethnic, cultural, religious-based or anything else, has the right to say who may or may not be granted citizenship status within whatever boundaries, borders or limitations it has set for itself.¹⁷⁶ This concept is generally based on three assertions: First, that it is the reasonable and rational result of the principles of individual freedoms and equal rights for all upon which most modern democratic states are based.¹⁷⁷ Second, that it is morally wrong to keep anyone from participating in the decision-making process of the entity that enforces the laws by which they must live.¹⁷⁸ Finally, that many of the problems facing the world today, such as the effects of global warming, human rights violations, and the exploitation of natural resources, can only be addressed on the global level that humanist citizenship theory advocates.¹⁷⁹

What all this adds up to is a citizenship theory with two very distinct levels. The first level may be labeled "aspirational"¹⁸⁰ or thought of as a hoped for future since every person in Earth does not live in a democracy or republic and, thus, is not governed by the same principles and, therefore, morals acknowledged by humanists as the foundation for the moral guidelines they advocate. The second level then is the possible practical application of the theory, such as the call for a change in the way citizenship is acquired by immigrants to democracies in the

¹⁷⁵ Alessandra Beasley, "Public Discourse and Cosmopolitan Political Identity," 134.

¹⁷⁶ Carens, "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship," 5.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁷⁸ Carens, "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship," 7.

¹⁷⁹ Martha Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," 5.

¹⁸⁰ Bosniak, "Citizenship Denationalized," 453.

present day, i.e., citizenship based on simple residency requirements with few, if any, other considerations such as criminality¹⁸¹ or language acquisition,¹⁸² and Nussbaum's call for a humanist perspective to the education of children so they are *not* taught that their nation, race, religion, etc. is any better, or more important, than any other in the world.¹⁸³ Such actions are seen as essential steps toward reaching the fulfillment of the aspirational level of humanist citizenship theory.

Each level of humanist citizenship theory also has different aspects that are relevant to homeland security. The aspirational level's focus on working toward full realization of the ideals on which our nation was founded, "all men are created equal," and that all men have certain inalienable rights, serves as a reminder of what the homeland security enterprise was established to protect in the first place, the populace and their the fundamental rights set out in our Constitution. While this may seem obvious to some, there are also those who believe homeland security too often forgets what it is trying to protect, so acknowledging and recognizing it as part of humanist citizenship theory would, at the very least, serve as evidence to the contrary.

The practical level of humanist citizenship theory may appear the least usable to the homeland security enterprise, at least at first glance, since it calls for no measure of attachment between the immigrant and the nation before citizenship status is granted. This is mostly due to the fact that homeland security is usually emphasized as being so intricately tied to the nation that its role in protecting the individual citizen and resident and, even, visitor is often forgotten. Still, calls for citizenship action and involvement in homeland security are generally made in reference to aiding the nation, thus, eliminating classes that help form a child's allegiance to the nation-state, which may have a negative impact his or her willingness to assist the homeland security community in the

¹⁸¹ Carens, "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship," 21.

¹⁸² Raffaele Marchetti, "Toward a World Migratory Regime," 478.

¹⁸³ Martha Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism," 4.

future, would not seem in the best interests of the homeland security enterprise. In these instances, it is necessary to look below the surface, at the reasons behind the proposed practical applications of humanist citizenship theory, to see their relevance to homeland security.

National citizenship based on a short residency would serve to help meet two goals of humanist citizenship theory on the national level. First, it would ensure that everyone living in a particular democratic polity would have an equal say in its governance without any significant delays. Second, it would help ensure all the residents of a particular democracy would have the same rights in the nation. Both of these goals may be characterized as methods of treating everyone, all humans, the same within a nation-state and, thus, promoting the concept that all humanity should be equal, have equal rights and be treated equally. The question then is how is this relevant to homeland security?

The basic answer is simply to say that the humanist call for equal treatment of everyone in the nation reminds the homeland security community that everyone in a democracy, including illegal aliens, does have some level of rights under the law, and those rights must be upheld at all times. Beyond that, the homeland security community must remember the unique circumstances and position of the immigrant community as a whole, and all its separate segments—different ethnicities, cultures, religions, diasporas, etc.,—within the United States “Unique” in that it represents a mixture of U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents and illegal aliens with the different levels of legal rights already mentioned, unique because of their relative or actual newness to American society, for how much or how little they may know about American society, and for the number of different perspectives they may have of the United States, based on the wide spectrum of backgrounds they have. It is in the best interests of the homeland security community to always be cognizant of their audience and who they interact with, and that is even truer when that group or groups include such a wide range of backgrounds. The same must be kept in mind at all times when the homeland security community looks to the integration of

immigrants into American society, to try and prevent the radicalization of the same population, and in the naturalization process through which those eligible in the immigrant community may become U.S. citizens. While this may not be the call for implementation the humanist citizenship theorists hope for, it does show the relevance of the humanist theoretical work to the homeland security enterprise.

The humanist call for what could be termed a non-nationalist education for our children is relevant to homeland security in two ways that are two sides of the same coin, in essence, but do not lend themselves to simple straightforward solutions. The two sides are to educate our children about the world around them, which is a laudable goal, but to also educate them about our nation and its history, principles, and way of government so they know enough to actively and knowingly participate in its governance. Just as with the call for naturalization after only a short term of residency, it is not the purpose herein to advocate a policy of non-nationalistic education. Rather this proposal is most relevant to homeland security at this time as a reminder of the need for greater understanding of the cultures, histories and backgrounds of the immigrant communities that are such an integral part of the United States. This would allow greater understanding of the immigrant communities' point of view when it comes to homeland security in the United States. It should also highlight the fact that the homeland security community should be interested in what is being taught about the nation and U.S. citizenship, since that may affect later actions of those children for or against homeland security once they are adults.

Humanist, or global and cosmopolitan as it is known in the literature, citizenship theory is relevant to the homeland security enterprise on both the theoretic and practical levels if not in the exact manner the humanists may hope for, i.e., as in no immediate implementation of its proposed practical applications. Still, humanist citizenship theory serves to remind the homeland security community of the founding principles of the United States, and how they apply to all within her borders no matter their legal status. It reminds the homeland

security community of its need to learn about the different parts of the immigrant community, in order to better communicate and interact with them, and to understand that they are still learning how to do the same with American society. It is also a reminder to the homeland security community that everyone they work with and for is a human being and deserving of respect. And, it serves to remind the homeland security community, as a whole and as individuals, that, while the current international climate calls for their vigilance on the part of freedom, the hope and dream of a time when peace makes them all look for a new occupation is still the hope of the world.

The next type of citizenship theory to be addressed has a number of names, but the one thing in common to diaspora and multicultural is their emphasis on the group and group rights. So, as in the literature review, this category will be called “group rights” from here on. Group rights theory is, for the most part, based on the premise that immigrant communities will better integrate into society when they are allowed to articulate their interests, and to set their demands on the political agenda.¹⁸⁴ But, there are almost as many definitions of multiculturalism as there are cultures and, while some specifically reject the idea of assimilation into the receiving nation’s society,¹⁸⁵ others promote the granting of group rights as a method of celebrating diversity while still building an integrated national society.¹⁸⁶

Perhaps the best way to view group rights citizenship theory is to envision a new dimension to the current democratic form of government we enjoy. Along with the individual rights enshrined in our Constitution, different groups such as immigrant communities based race, ethnicity, clan, religion, etc.,¹⁸⁷ would also have specific rights as groups. The rights requested in group rights citizenship

¹⁸⁴ Bloemraad, “Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada,” 475.

¹⁸⁵ Bauböck, “Farewell to Multiculturalism?” 6.

¹⁸⁶ Rhoda Howard-Hassmann, “‘Canadian’ as an Ethnic Category,” 1.

¹⁸⁷ Or other groups based on gender, political agendas, and sexual orientation. These last, while group-based, fall into in the fourth category of citizenship theory on account of their specific age and, due to time constraints, will not be discussed further.

theory range from voting rights granted with few, if any, requirements beyond residency, and group-based political organizations that are to be given specific rights in the government, to full recognition and acceptance of dual citizenship and ready access to most public-sector jobs based on group membership.

Beyond just the integration concerns already mentioned, some of the other factors behind this call for group rights include recognition of the importance of the cultural ties¹⁸⁸ immigrants have to their countries of origin, and the greater and continued connectivity to those places through the Internet, and relatively cheap long-distance and airfare costs.¹⁸⁹ Another factor is the growing adoption of dual citizenship among immigrant sending nations that allows immigrants to continually participate in the governance of their countries of origin,¹⁹⁰ if absentee voting is allowed, as well as hold on to legal rights affecting issues such as inheritance and property ownership.¹⁹¹ Finally, proponents of group rights citizenship highlight the fact that there are few social benefits, other than, usually, national voting rights and eligibility for most public-sector jobs, afforded to citizens in most democratic nations that are not already available to immigrant residents,¹⁹² so there is little reason not to afford these groups such rights. This perspective also uses the same justification for its goals as used by the humanists, saying that it is inherently counter to the core principles of democratic government to keep any segment of the population living under the

¹⁸⁸ Tariq Modood, "Remaking multiculturalism after 7/7," *Open Democracy* (September 29, 2005): 3, under "multiculturalism," <http://www.opendemocracy.net/content/articles/PDF/2879.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2011).

¹⁸⁹ Damian Tambini, "Post-national Citizenship," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, No. 2 (March 2001): 199, under "citizenship," <http://hevro.haifa.ac.ill-soc/lecturers/smooha/files/1776.pdf> (accessed April 7, 2011).

¹⁹⁰ Peter J. Spiro, "Embracing Dual Nationality," *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (1998): 5, under "citizenship," <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=174&prog=zgp> (accessed February 17, 2011).

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁹² Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, eds. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*, Chapter Three.

rule of such a government from having a voice in its deliberative processes.¹⁹³ Also, in a manner similar to humanist citizenship theory, group rights advocates see no reason the same citizenship rights now afforded to individuals should not also be available based on group membership. Thus, group membership is viewed as simply another identity layer, or, to borrow from the humanist, concentric circle that should be recognized and should not impede the acquisition of another type of citizenship.

Group rights citizenship theory raises a lot of issues that the homeland security community should be very interested in, as they have a direct impact on its ability to fulfill its mission, and to its mission overall. First and foremost is the fact that many of today's immigrants are far more focused on their countries of origin, rather than on the United States, simply because of greater and easier means for doing so. One measure of the immigrant community's greater and continuing interaction with their countries of origin is the growing number of sending nations that now allow emigrants to keep their original citizenship, even if they acquire another, which is reported to be 133 nations as of 2005.¹⁹⁴ Another work that addresses dual and multiple citizenships speaks to what some of the nations who allow dual citizenship expect from their migrant citizens.¹⁹⁵ In Latin America, where people are, for the most part, the most important export of many of the nations, the main reason for allowing multiple citizenships is seen as being their need for "tax money and economic and social investment activity."¹⁹⁶ And, while remittances from their migrant citizens are important, politicians in Mexico and the Dominican Republic also routinely campaign in the United States among their migrant communities.¹⁹⁷ Once again, the addition of political activity

¹⁹³ Bauböck, "Farewell to Multiculturalism?" 2.

¹⁹⁴ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 12.

¹⁹⁵ Sybil D. Rhodes, "The Comparative Politics of Formal and *De facto* Multiple Citizenships: How do Countries Treat Their Citizens Who Leave?" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August 2003), under "citizenship" <http://aspa.net> (accessed March 30, 2011).

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

from another country taking place in the United States could, potentially, distract the immigrant or dual citizen's attention from participation in the U.S. system itself. Yet another concern is that immigrant populations with strong connections to their countries of origin may, once they have naturalized in the receiving nation, use their numbers to try and influence the receiving nation's policies, in either a positive or negative way, toward the sending nations.¹⁹⁸ Such are some of the ways immigrant populations are tied to, involved with, and concerned about their countries of origins while living and working in their receiving nations.

All of this means the homeland security community needs to be concerned with how much the immigrant community is, or is not, learning about and participating in American society, since homeland security relies on an active, engaged populace to fulfill its mission. It also means homeland security needs to follow political trends and action in immigrant sending nations to be prepared for any possible actions, such as sending nations' attempts to influence U.S. policy in their favor, or the immigrants' attempt to sour U.S. relations with their countries of origin that may occur in the United States. Second is the issue of dual citizenship, which should focus the homeland security community on things like *loyalty to*, and *participation in* the United States for people who are also, or may be, still participating in the governance of their countries of origin. It should also remind the homeland security community that actions immigrants take to continue participation in their countries of origin may either not be in accordance with U.S. law, or may break U.S. law outright and thus may impact the immigrant's status to be in the United States. An example of this possibility would be if an immigrant donated funds to an organization in his or her country of origin that is classified as a terrorist organization by the U.S. government. Even if the donation was for charity work done by the organization, such as Hamas may provide in Palestine, the terrorist designation would make the donation be considered as providing "material support" to a terrorist organization, which can make an individual inadmissible to the United States and, thus, ineligible for most

¹⁹⁸ Christopher Rudolph, "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," 12.

immigration benefits and status.¹⁹⁹ A third possible area of concern is more remote but should still remain of concern to the homeland security community and that is doing whatever possible to keep any clan, tribal, regional, political, religious, etc., disputes in the immigrants' countries of origin from manifesting in the United States. Finally, the homeland security community needs to consider how the close interaction and interconnectivity between immigrant communities in the United States and their countries of origin may affect the United States' relations with those nations in terms of international cooperation on security concerns. Thus, group rights citizenship theory should be of special interest to the homeland security community for the insights it contains on the workings and concerns of the communities that make up the ever-growing and diverse immigrant population in the United States; a community that is ever more connected to its sending nations.

The final category of citizenship theory for discussion here combines postnational and transnational theory, though some authors treat these as separate theoretical areas.²⁰⁰ The two are combined here for two main reasons: First, both specify in their labels that citizenship should no longer be tied solely to a single nation, hence, "post" and "trans." Second, both include the affects of globalization as one of their main reasons for their calls to change the nature of citizenship. Postnational citizenship theory generally points to the European Union as an example of how citizenship no longer has to, or should, be based on a single nation-state, even though one cannot be a citizen of the European Union without first being a citizen of one of its member nation-states. Another claim toward the postnational state of citizenship is the fact that aliens resident in most democratic states receive most of the same benefits as do full citizens. This is

¹⁹⁹ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, *Immigration and Nationality Act*, Section 212(d)(3)(B), "General Classes of Aliens Ineligible to Receive Visas and Ineligible for Admission" under "terrorist," <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.f6da51a2342135be7e9d7a10e0dc91a0/?vgnextoid=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=fa7e539dc4bed010VgnVCM1000000ecd190aRCRD&CH=act> (accessed November 4, 2011).

²⁰⁰ Bosniak, "Citizenship Denationalized," 449.

found to the greatest extent in Europe, and especially Scandinavia, where some local governments have even afforded some measure of voting rights to resident aliens.²⁰¹ This trend is said to lessen the strength of the linkage between citizenship status and that of the nation-state to the point where it should cease to exist sooner than later. This is, of course, a variation on similar arguments made in both the humanist and group rights categories of citizenship theory.²⁰²

Transnational citizenship theory tends to invoke the same reasons for denationalizing citizenship as the postnational but with more emphasis on the greater and ever-growing interconnectivity of migrant populations with their countries of origin while they live and work in another nation. Hence, the “trans” national aspect of their citizenships, especially when the immigrant in question is allowed to hold formal (dual) citizenship in both their country of origin and their country of residence. Trans and postnational citizenship theorists both discuss how the continuing movement of money, production, and the labor needed to produce goods and services under globalization shows no signs of abating, and how denationalizing citizenship will both ease the movement of labor and foster greater understanding among peoples as they move and intermix at a far greater level than ever before.²⁰³ It is also stressed in trans and postnational citizenship theory that the nation-state is no longer of vital importance for the guarantee of human rights which are now seen as part of international law, which grows stronger in its ability to affect human interaction every day.²⁰⁴ This is the vital combination that justifies the movement away from nation-based citizenship: supranational organizations like the European Union, globalization with its mass

²⁰¹ David C. Earnest, “Neither Citizen nor Stranger: Why States Enfranchise Resident Aliens,” *World Politics* 58, No. 2 (January 2006): 259, under “citizenship,” http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/world_politics/v058/58.2earnest.pdf (accessed April 14, 2011).

²⁰² Marchetti, “Toward a Migratory Regime”.

²⁰³ Kim Rubenstein, “Globalisation and Citizenship and Nationality,” 28.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

migration, and cross-border movement of funding and production capability topped off with human rights guaranteed on a world basis by the growing reach of international law.

Trans and postnational citizenship theory re-emphasizes some aspects from other types of denationalized citizenship theory for homeland security, such as the importance of the continued connectivity between immigrants and their countries of origin and the possible impact that connectivity may have on U.S. international security relations, but these theories add new items as well. For example, the emphasis on globalization should remind the homeland security community of the ever more complex methods of moving money, goods and people available to international terrorists that exists within the overall globalization movement. Similarly, supranational organizations like the European Union create yet another layer of government with which the homeland security community must interact, cooperate, and coordinate in order to try and keep the nation secure while it functions in the middle of the globalized economy.²⁰⁵

The reach of international law, while still dependent on the nation-state's agreement to follow its directions, is growing and, since many other nations do follow its dictates, must be considered by the homeland security community as it works with the immigrant communities and their sending nations, as well as the general international community. Finally, the homeland security community needs to bear in mind the possible, if not probable, global scope and reach of the businesses it may contract with while fulfilling its mission. Both privacy and security considerations must be scrutinized to ensure that which is protected by law in the United States is not being shared under the law of another nation in which that contractor just happens to have a license. Just as trans and postnational citizenship theory works to expand the meaning and application of citizenship beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, it also should have the homeland security community expanding its attention beyond the borders, to the

²⁰⁵ Stewart Baker, *Skating on Stilts: Why We aren't Stopping Tomorrow's Terrorism* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2010) part two.

global impact of immigrant interconnectivity, international security and economic relations, and to the expanding number of governmental actors it must work with to fulfill its mission.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

At first glance, there would appear to be little of practical use that the homeland security community could learn from denationalized citizenship theory currently being discussed by the academic world. After all, homeland security derives its existence from the nation-state and, as was made quite obvious in the literature review, most of those theories see either no need for nation-based citizenship or, they conjecture that nation-based citizenship has little meaning in today's world and will have none in the future. In reality, though, the current work on citizenship contains a number of insights, facts, and trends that the homeland security community needs to acknowledge, understand and, in some instances, incorporate when possible in order to complete its mission of providing security for the people and the nation. These range from specific trends in immigration populations that need to be addressed, to the overall perception of national and homeland security that is shown in the citizenship work, all of which impact the homeland security enterprise on one level or another. While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to address the entire subject of citizenship theory, and its relevance to homeland security, the points discussed herein are considered to touch upon some of the most pressing homeland security concerns in promoting integration, combating radicalization, promoting naturalization to gain U.S. citizenship, and overall homeland security interaction with the immigrant population in the United States.

Out of the tremendous amount of information on citizenship currently under discussion, with more and more being added every day, there are ideas, facts and recommendations that homeland security needs to understand, consider, and implement if possible, in order to more effectively promote and utilize citizenship in the United States for the homeland security enterprise. Ranging from the utilitarian to the theoretical, these insights into citizenship could, potentially, contribute not only to areas of homeland security concern such

as immigrant integration, and to counter radicalization, they could also help boost citizenship engagement with homeland security efforts overall.

Almost all of the theoretical work on citizenship over the last 20 years emphasizes the change in the sending nations of the current mass migration—from mostly European to Asian, African, and Latin American—and how the most recent immigrants have far greater interaction with their countries of origin than any previous generation on account of the advances in communication and transportation. But what does that mean in terms of homeland security? First, it means the homeland security community needs to learn as much as possible about the “new” sending nations, their history, culture, and politics in order to better understand why these immigrant communities think and act the way they do. This insight will allow the homeland security components with direct interaction with the immigrant communities to better craft their efforts to the community in question. An example where this would be of great importance is in the area of integration of peoples from honor/shame based societies into our guilt/innocence rule of law based system. Being able to explain how an honor/shame scenario would play out in a rule of law society, and why, would certainly help when working with Iraqis, Yemenis, Afghans, etc. The goal, of course, is not to say our system is better but, rather, to demonstrate how our system may be used to deal with the same problems/disputes that may arise, and that there is no shame in our society in doing so.

Interaction between the homeland security community and the immigrant population at this level could be done, at the federal level, through U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services’ work with community-based organizations (CBOs) in the form of training or by direct interaction. This could also be incorporated into local law enforcement’s community policing efforts to show immigrants from these types of cultures how the system works. Consider how valuable it would be to our integration efforts to assure an immigrant community that their disputes will be dealt with fairly by explaining the process in terms they understand, rather than just telling them they have to follow our foreign system.

Consider the greater value to be had by doing this, as, by demonstrating we understand their unique cultures and their histories while we ask them to learn of ours, the immigrant community is more readily acclimated to join in the great experiment that is the United States of America.

The next step is to work toward focusing the immigrant population, at least partially, on their lives here in the United States as opposed to the life they left back home. This is not an easy proposition since the Internet, multimedia and easy international travel have made it so easy to “keep in touch” with their countries of origin in the past few decades. It will, therefore, be the job of the homeland security community to formulate the integration and citizenship processes to emphasize more than just the ideals and history of the United States. It must emphasize the need for immigrant active participation and involvement in the economy and society of the United States in order to preserve the circumstances that have allowed them the opportunities they came to America to enjoy. This idea is, perhaps, best summed up in a saying of the Ibo people of Nigeria: “Where one dwells is where one is duty bound to uphold and protect²⁰⁶.” The United States cannot simply be the place to come and exploit the opportunities available because we have an open society that allows them access. It cannot become the place of a kind of reverse colonization where the peoples of less developed nations come and take advantage of the opportunities of the developed nation, simply to help develop their own countries of origin and do little or nothing to continue the development of ours.

A secondary, but still important point that the homeland security community must act on involves communication and it is found in the discussions of the ease of international interaction in today’s world. The homeland security community must fully utilize all the latest methods of communication and technology in its interaction with the immigrant population in the United States. While conventional means, such as TV., radio, and local foreign language

²⁰⁶ Ifezue Okoli, *Tribalizing America: A Social Evolution of the American Society* (Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2004), 26.

newspapers may still be the best means to reach the older generations of immigrants, the newest arrivals and, most often, the second and third generations of the immigrant populations, are just as immersed in the Internet, Facebook™ and Twitter™ as our own youth, and those are the methods that must be utilized if we are going to capture their attention and get our message across. This is especially important to remember in the area of trying to combat radicalization among immigrants, since it is one of the main sources for terrorist propaganda throughout the world. While there are specific privacy and legal considerations for the use of social media for law enforcement purposes that are now and must continue to be addressed, the homeland security community still needs to work on better use of these mediums for the promotion of integration and citizenship among the immigrant communities.

One other aspect of working to better integrate the immigrant population, especially those who become naturalized citizens, that must be addressed is rather tricky, to put it very mildly, and it involves the consequences under U.S. law of activities they may be supporting in their countries of origin. In general, the point here is not to protect the immigrants from the law but, rather, to instill in that population the fact that their actions, whether done to help or hinder their country of origin, may have specific and permanent consequences for their immigration status in the United States. For example, the concept of providing material support to terrorist organizations. Currently, under the *PATRIOT Act*²⁰⁷ and the *Immigration and Nationality Act*,²⁰⁸ many of the activities that many immigrants would consider only to be assisting the political opposition, or freedom fighters, back home fall into the legal category of providing material support to terrorists, which renders them ineligible for most immigration benefits and status in the United States. This is an instance where it is both the immigrants' responsibility

²⁰⁷ USA PATRIOT Act of 2001, Public Law 107-51, 107th Cong (October 26, 2001), under "Patriot" http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=107_cong_public_laws&docid=f:publ056.107 (accessed October 30, 2011).

²⁰⁸ *Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952* as amended.

to understand the law involved and its consequences, and the homeland security community's responsibility to assist the immigrants in understanding a law that is both very vague in meaning, very broad in scope, and includes fairly extreme consequences for anyone found breaking it. It is also a situation that may serve as an excellent example of just how important it is for the immigrants to do more than work and live in the United States and yet, focuses more on their country of origin than on America, and how that interaction with their country of origin may affect their situation in the United States.

One of the most discussed subjects in citizenship theory is that of dual or multiple citizenship and its alleged effects on the individual immigrant and the sending and receiving nations in the immigration cycle. These effects are either seen as benefitting all by its proponents, or benefitting only the immigrant and the sending nations by those in the opposition.²⁰⁹ No recommendation will be made here to either adopt the acceptance of dual citizenship into U.S. law or enforce restrictions on a person's ability to obtain multiple citizenships, as that is beyond the scope of the current work. Instead, the recommendations made will be to raise the awareness of the possible "big picture" implications of the growing proliferation of dual citizenship among immigrant sending nations, as well as a call for a level of standardization in how the homeland security community reacts in certain instances to the appearance of that second (or third, etc.) passport.

The major overarching implications of dual citizenship that should be of concern to the homeland security community are:

1. Loyalty—This is a question often raised by opponents of dual citizenship,²¹⁰ that dual citizens cannot show two countries the level of loyalty and participation necessary for a cohesive national society.

²⁰⁹ See earlier discussion of both sides of dual citizenship debate in literature review, this thesis.

²¹⁰ Renshon, *The 50% American*, 170.

2. “Instructed voting”²¹¹—This is the idea that the sending nation that allows its citizens to obtain and hold dual citizenship may try to use its influence on its immigrant population in the United States to steer U.S. policy in its favor.

On the surface, both of these issues may seem beyond the scope of homeland security but that is not true. Recall the first scenario from the introduction of this thesis wherein an individual of dual Pakistan/U.S. citizenship, hired by the FBI, had to sign a separate loyalty oath in order to take the job he was hired for, and for which he had obtained the required security clearance. Open source information shows that the same secondary loyalty oath (“secondary” due to the fact that it is an oath to be signed in addition to the required oath of any U.S. civil servant when starting the job) is required by the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) whenever a dual citizen wants to join the organizations but, a call to the human resources section of the National Security Agency (NSA) revealed no such loyalty oath is required of dual citizens seeking employment in that organization. This situation symbolizes the lack of any formal consensus regarding dual citizenship, even among federal agencies, let alone the entire homeland security community. When one considers the importance of equal treatment of U.S. citizenry by the federal government to the promotion of obtaining U.S. citizenship among the immigrant population, standardization of even this one aspect of dual citizenship may serve to spark movement toward further standardization in this important area of citizenship.

The idea of a sending nation directing its immigrant population in the United States to use its U.S. citizenship to try and influence American policy may seem a bit farfetched but statements to that exact effect²¹² have been made. And, though these same statements have been labeled as merely “indiscreet” and, thus, of no importance by some,²¹³ the possibility that a sending nation

²¹¹ Aleinikoff and Klusmeyer, *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*, 32.

²¹² Renshon, *The 50% American*, 174.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 175.

could try to affect U.S. policy should not be simply brushed off as unimportant. This should be seen as another factor that may affect decisions on U.S. homeland security policy and, thus, deserves the same interest and attention as would be given to such domestic concerns as party politics and budget concerns. As stated earlier, these recommendations do not include the acceptance or rejection of dual citizenship nor, it should be stated, do they exhaust the subject with regards to homeland security. Instead, these two aspects of dual citizenship are presented as two that may have the greatest impact on homeland security in the short term and, therefore, are most deserving of the attention of the homeland security community.

The idea of a sending nation trying to influence U.S. policy in its favor through its U.S.-based immigrant population brings up another aspect of integration and citizenship that should be of interest to the homeland security community, namely, when the immigrant population wants U.S. policy to work against the government of its sending nation. An example of this has existed in the United States since the late 1950s in the Cuban-Americans in the Miami area who have worked so ardently to keep U.S. policy opposed to the Castro-led Communist regime in Cuba. Such opposition can be a two-edged sword in terms of homeland security issues, and the homeland security community must be duly cautious and cognizant of the phenomenon. One only has to imagine the potential problems if the Mexican/Mexican-American population became fractured over backing different candidates in a Mexican election, and both turned to the United States to throw its weight behind its favored contender to see how the situation could become problematic very quickly within the United States, on the border and within Mexico as well. How then to keep the United States secure when a significant portion of its population is up in arms—hopefully, not literally though that is always a possibility too—and there is no good side for the United States to be on? The possibility may seem far-fetched, and certainly may never happen, but that does not lessen the possible impact of such a situation if it did happen, or the point that the homeland security

community needs to pay attention to such potential situations and work to alleviate or mitigate their possible occurrence through better integration and citizenship policies and practices.

The other lesson to be learned from all the discussion about how sending nations are trying to use their immigrant populations to affect U.S. policy is that the United States also has its own migrant population living in other nations around the world, and they too may serve as America's voice in foreign lands. While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to recommend the use of Americans overseas to influence the policies of other nations, this is a call for the homeland security community to recognize and consider U.S. citizens living abroad as a resource for information collection and dissemination as well as contacts within other nations. Though the international aspect of homeland security is mentioned in both the *National Security Strategy*²¹⁴ and the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*,²¹⁵ the role of U.S. citizens living abroad appears under-recognized and under-utilized by the homeland security community.

A. THE MOST RELEVANT ELEMENTS OF CITIZENSHIP THEORY FOR HOMELAND SECURITY

1. Greater understanding of immigrant cultures and history.
2. Greater effort to show the immigrant communities how their concerns will be considered and met, to the extent possible by law, in the American system.
3. Greater efforts to raise awareness in the immigrant community of the need for their attention and participation in American society.
4. Greater effort to utilize the right media and means of communication to reach the different generations of the immigrant community.

²¹⁴ *National Security Strategy* (2010): 17.

²¹⁵ *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (2007): 9.

5. Greater effort to raise comprehension amongst the immigrant population of the potential consequences and effect on their status within the United States of certain actions they may take as part of their greater continued interaction with groups in their countries of origin.
6. Standardization of policy regarding any questions of loyalty to the United States for people holding dual and/or multiple citizenships.
7. Greater interest in and comprehension of the possible outcomes of immigrant political activism to influence U.S. policy for or against their sending nations, and how it may affect homeland security.

The seven items above were found to be the most relevant to homeland security in the realm of promoting integration and citizenship, based on the analysis and synthesis of denationalized citizenship theory performed for this thesis.

Looking back on the four scenarios presented in the introduction to this thesis, each involved one or more U.S. citizens and some interaction with a government entity but, none involved what could be called a stereotypical “average American.” The purpose of presenting these scenarios was to provide just a few examples of the myriad of variations of interactions members of the homeland security community may have with U.S. citizens of unique circumstances on any given day. They also serve to show how the label “U.S. citizen” calls for equal treatment and equal rights, but the circumstances in which one is encountered may change the nature of any encounter between the citizen and the homeland security community. Dual citizenship plays a part in “the Loyalty Oath” and “the Rescue” and could benefit from some standardization in the overall policy of the government toward that status. “Basic English?” and “Security Problem?” both involve questions of the levels of integration, if any, that have occurred in these three U.S. citizens. Now, while levels of integration will always vary between individuals, greater efforts to assist in the integration of immigrants will always be in both the immigrants and the U.S.’ best interests, if only to ease interaction on all levels. It is hoped that these scenarios, and the

analysis, synthesis and recommendations presented herein, serve to heighten the homeland security community's interest and understanding of the importance of denationalized citizenship theory to the integration and citizenship processes to both the immigrants' ability to function and add to American society and to homeland security's ability to interact with, serve, and call upon the immigrants in the course of their duties.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abraham, David. "Constitutional Patriotism, Citizenship and Belonging in America and Germany." *Temple Political & Civil Rights Law Review* 16 (2006-2007).
<http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/temper16&div.=22&gsent=1&collection=journals> (accessed April, 20, 2011).
- . *Citizenship Solidarity and Rights Individualism: On the Decline of National Citizenship in the U.S., Germany, and Israel*. San Diego, California: University of California, San Diego - The Center for Comparative Immigration Status (2002). <http://www.ccis-hcsd.org/PUBLICATIONS/wrkq53.PDF> (accessed February 4, 2011).
- Alcántar, Rocio. *Dual Citizenship in the United States: Divided Loyalties or an Inevitable Consequence of a Globalized World?* Chicago, IL: DePaul University College of Law (2009).
http://www.law.depaul.edu/clinical_programs/pdf/5_9.pdf (accessed on March 20, 2011).
- Aleinikoff, T. Alexander and Douglas Klusmeyer, eds. *Citizenship Policies for an Age of Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2002.
- . "Plural nationality: Facing the future in a migratory world." In *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*, edited by T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer, 63. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.
- Aleinikoff, T. Alexander and Douglas Klusmeyer, eds. *Citizenship Today - Global Perspectives and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2001.
- Andrews, Dr Rhys and Dr Michael Marinetto. "No Place like Home? Britishness, Multiculturalism and the Politics of Utopia." Political Studies Association, Edinburgh, Scotland, March 29 - April 1, 2010.
<http://www.psa.ac.uk/Proceedings/2010> (accessed March 31, 2011).
- Aptekar, Sofya. *Naturalization Ceremonies and Immigrant Citizenship*.
http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/3/0/9/1/4/p309145_index.html (accessed April 22, 2011).

- Arab American Institute Foundation. *Profiling and Pride: Arab American Attitudes and Behavior since September 11*. Washington, D.C.: Arab American Institute Foundation, 2002. <http://www.aaiusa.org/reports/profiling-and-pride-arab-american-attitudes-and-behavior-since-september-11/> (accessed April 20, 2011).
- Arneil, Barbara. "Global Citizenship and Empire." *Citizenship Studies* 11, no. 3 (2007). <http://ppkn.flap.uns.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/globalcitizenship.pdf> (accessed April 20, 2011).
- Arnn, Larry P. "The Meaning of American Citizenship." Claremont, CA: The Claremont Institute, 1997. http://www.claremont.org/publications/pub_print.asp?pubid=488 (accessed March 29, 2011).
- Awan, Muhammad Safeer. "Rise of Global Terror and (Re)formulations of Muslim Identity since September 11." *Interdisciplinary Net*, 2010. <http://www.interdisciplinary.net/wp.content/upload/2010/06/awanpaper.pdf> (accessed February 17, 2011).
- Axtell, Matthew. "A Pledge of Double Allegiance: Prospectus for a New Inquiry of Dual Citizenship in the United States." 2009. http://works.bepress.com/libproxy.nps.edu/matthew_axtell/6/ (accessed April 13, 2011).
- Bach, Robert and David J. Kaufman. "A Social Infrastructure for Hometown Security: Advancing the Homeland Security Paradigm." *Homeland Security Affairs*, V, No. 2 (2009). <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&doc=109866&coll=limited> (accessed 04-08-2011).
- Baker, Stewart A. *Skating on Stilts: Why We aren't Stopping Tomorrow's Terrorism*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press (2010).
- Barkalow, Jordon B. "The Poverty of Ascriptive Ideologies: A Theory of American Citizenship." Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 1–4, 2005. http://research.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/3/9/9/0/p39902_index.html?phpsessid=464f521d89db5520143c97da0ac8d614 (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Barney, Darin. "'Excuse Us if We don't Give a Fuck': The (Anti-) Political Career of Participation." *Jeunesse: Young People, Texts, Cultures* 2, no. 2 (2010). <http://jeunessejournal.ca/index.php/yptc/article/viewFile/78/71> (accessed 04-15-2011).

- Barnhart, Sara Catherine. "Second Class Delivery: The Elimination of Birthright Citizenship as a Repeal of "The Pursuit of Happiness". *Georgia Law Review* 42 (2007-2008). <http://heinonline.org> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Barry, Kim. "Home and Away: The Construction of Citizenship in an Emigration Context." New York, NY: New York University School of Law - New York University Public Law and Legal Theory Working Papers (2006).
[http://lsr.nellco.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?articles/o22&content=nyu_plltwp&ci-redir=1#search=""Americancitizenship""](http://lsr.nellco.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?articles/o22&content=nyu_plltwp&ci-redir=1#search=) (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Bauböck, Rainer. "Farewell to Multiculturalism? Sharing Values and Identities in Societies of Immigration." *Journal of International Migration and Integration/Revue De l'Integration Et De La Migration Internationale* 3, no. 1 (2002).
<http://www.springerlink.com.libproxy.nps.edu/content/a7k1826u373p0935/> (02-09-2011).
- . "Citizenship and National Identities in the European Union[1]." New York, NY: New York University, The Jean Monnet Center for International and Regional Economic Law and Justice, Working Paper (1997).
<http://centers.law.nyu.edu/jeanmonnet/papers/97/97-04--4.html> (accessed 02-17-2011).
- Beasley, Alessandra. "Public Discourse and Cosmopolitan Political Identity: Imagining the European Union Citizen." *Futures*, 38 (2006).
<http://www.sciencedirect.com.libproxy.nps.edu>
<http://www.elsevier.com.libproxy.nps.edu/locate/futures> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Berger, Kathleen Stassen. *Immigration, Psychosocial Development: Implications for Africa and the U.S.* AfricanImmigration.com
<http://www.africanimmigration.com/Immigration.htm> (accessed 01-30-2011).
- Berman, Paul Schiff. "Towards a Cosmopolitan Vision of Conflict of Laws: Redefining Governmental Interests in a Global Era." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* 153, No. 6 (2005).
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=725221 (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Bernstein-Baker, Judith. "Citizenship in a Restrictionist Era: The Mixed Messages of Federal Policies." *Temple Political & Civil Rights Law Review* 16 (2006-2007).
http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/temper.16&div=19&g_sent=1&collection=journals (accessed 04-20-2011).

- Bhabha, Jacqueline. "The 'Mere Fortuity' of Birth? Are Children Citizens?" *Differences* 15, No. 2 (2004).
<http://differences.dukejournals.org/content/15/2/91.full.pdf+html> (accessed 08-20-2010).
- Black, David M. *Trends in democracy and citizenship*. Canada Library of Parliament - Parliamentary Information and Research Service (2006).
<http://www2.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/cp3-e.pdf> (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Bloemraad, Irene. "Becoming a Citizen in the United States and Canada: Structured Mobilization and Immigrant Political Incorporation." *Social Forces* 85, No. 2 (2006).
http://sociology.berkeley.edu/profiles/bloemraad/pdf/Bloemraad_Social_Forces_Dec_2006.pdf (02-05-2011).
- Bloemraad, Irene and Reed Ueda. "Naturalization & Nationality." In *A Companion to American Immigration*, edited by Reed Ueda, 36. Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2006.
http://sociology.berkeley.edu/profiles/bloemraad/pdf/Bloemraad_Ueda_Nationality_Blackwell_2006.pdf (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Bloodsworth-Lugo, Mary K. and Carmen R. Lugo-Lugo. "Citizenship and the Browning of Terror." *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice* 20 (2008).
http://wsu.academia.edu/MaryBloodsworthLugo/Papers/307241/Citizenship_and_the_Browning_of_Terror (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Bonikowski, Bart. "Beyond National Identity: Collective Schemata of the Nation in Thirty Countries," Social Science Research Network Electronic Library, 2009. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/paper.cfm?abstract_id=1449167 (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Bosniak, Linda. "Constitutional Citizenship Through the Prism of Alienage," *Ohio State Law Journal* 63, No. 5 (2002).
<http://moritzlaw.osu.edu/lawjournal/issues/volume63/number5/bosniak.pdf> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- . "Citizenship Denationalized." *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 7, No. 2 (2000). <http://javvo.com/colerche/documents/citi.pdf> (accessed 01-15-2011).
- . "The Citizenship of Aliens." *Social Text* 16, No. 3 (1998).
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/pss/466764> (accessed 02-04-2011).

- Breiner, Peter. "Cosmopolitan Citizenship: An Extension of Domestic Struggles for Political Equality?" Paper presented at 49th annual meeting of the International Studies Association, San Francisco, CA, March 26, 2008.
http://www.allacademic.com/one/iso/isa08/index.php?click_key=11
(accessed 04-13-2011).
- Brettell, Caroline B. "Anthropology, Migration, and Comparative Consciousness." *New Literacy History* 40, No. 3 (2009).
http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&sqi=2&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fmuse.jhu.edu%2Fjournals%2Fnew_literary_history%2Fv040%2F40.3.brettell.pdf&ei=GUS3TseULOjk2QXI_fzMDQ&usq=AFQjCNHiHe0G4IRJwZLz64ksnqCO-bH4Xg (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Brubaker, Rogers. "Migration, Membership, and the Modern Nation-State: Internal and External Dimensions of the Politics of Belonging," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 41, No. 1(2010).
<http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/jinh.2010.41.1.61>
(accessed 04-15-2011).
- Bruno, Andorra. "Immigration Legislation and Issues in the 109th Congress [electronic resource]". CRS report for Congress, RL33125. Washington, D.C: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2006.
<http://opencrs.com/document/RL33125> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Bryce, James. *Promoting Good Citizenship*. Cambridge: Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1913.
http://books.google.com/books?id=XNogAAAAMAAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Promoting+good+citizenship.&hl=en&ei=L0W3TtaXA4u3twecqP3YA w&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CDQQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false (accessed 03-29-2011).
- Burnett, Christina Duffy. "'They Say I am not an American...': The Noncitizen National and the Law of American Empire," *Virginia Journal of International Law* 48, No. 4 (2008).
http://scs.student.virginia.edu/~vjil/PDF/48_660-719.pdf (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Bybee, Keith J., Margarita Estevez-Abe, Glyn Morgan, Jill Frank, Robert Odawi Porter, Kal Raustiala, Steven Levitsky, and Lucan A. Way. "Citizenship at Home and Abroad," *International Studies Review* 7, No. 3 (2005).
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/3699779> (accessed 04-15-2011).

- Canada House of Commons. *Second Report - The Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration*. Ottawa, Canada: Canada House of Commons, 1999,
<http://www2.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?DocId=1031858&Language=E&Modc=1&Parl=36&ses=1> (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Carens, Joseph H. "Immigration, Democracy, and Citizenship." In *Of States, Rights, and Social Closure: Governing Migration and Citizenship*, edited by Oliver Schmidtke and Saime Ozcurumez. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- . "Reflections on American Citizenship and Immigration," Washington, D.C.: Center for Immigration Studies (2008) <http://www.cis.org> (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Cavanaugh, Richard. "Citizenship - What does It mean to be a Citizen?" Eastern Illinois University, 2006.
http://www.ux1.cia.edu/~recavanaugh/Richard%20Cavanaugh%20Eastern%20Illinois%20University_files/22006%20Staff/Citizenship.ppt_25b,1,Citizenship (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Chishti, Muzaffar A., Doris Meissner, Demetrios G. Papademetriou, Jay Peterzell, Michael J. Wishnie, and Stephen W. Yale-Loehr. "America's Challenge: Domestic Security, Civil Liberties, and National Unity After September 11." Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute (2003).
<http://www.migrationpolicy.org> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Cohen, Elizabeth F. "*Jus Tempus* in the Magna Carta: The Sovereignty of Time in Modern Politics and Citizenship," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43, No. 3 (2010).
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstracts_id=1599943 (accessed 02-15-2011).
- Cohen, William. "Equal Treatment for Newcomers: The Core Meaning of National and State Citizenship," *Constitutional Commentary* 1984, no. 1 (1984).
<http://heinonline.org> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Cole, David. "Against Citizenship as a Predicate for Basic Rights," *Fordham Law Review* 75 (2007). <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/facpub/73> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Conover, Pamela Johnston and Donald D. Searing. "The Elusive Ideal of Equal Citizenship: Political Theory and Political Psychology in the United States and Great Britain." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, 2002.
<http://www.aspanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).

- Cristina, Popa Nistorescu. "The Connection between the European Citizenship and the Free Movement of Persons." Social Science Research Network Electronic Library (December 8, 2008).
<http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/abstract=1313013> (accessed 11-20-2010).
- Cruz, Consuelo. "Neither Gentleman nor Citizens: First World Models and Third Wave Products." Columbia University - Institute for Latin American and Iberian Studies. <http://www.ciaonet.org.libproxy.nps.edu/wps/coc01> (accessed 04-06-2011).
- Dagnino, Evelina. "A Perverse Confluence," *Development in Practice* 17, No. 4/5 (2007). <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/25548252> (accessed 04-08-2011).
- Dalton, Russell J. "Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation," *Political Studies* 56, (2008).
<http://www.socsci.uci.edu/~rdalton/archive/polstudies08.pdf> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- . "Citizenship Norms and Political Participation in America: The Good News Is ... the Bad News is Wrong." Georgetown University - The Center for Democracy and Civil Society, Occasional Paper (2006).
<http://www8.georgetown.edu/centers/cdacs/cid/DaltonOccasionalPaper.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Dauvergne, Catherine. "Making People Illegal: What Globalization Means for Migration and Law," *International Journal of Refugee Law* 21, No. 2 (2007). <http://ijrl.oxfordjournals.org/content/21/2/371.extract> (accessed April 24, 2011).
- DeVoretz, Don J. "Immigrant Circulation and Citizenship: Hotel Canada?" Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Discussion Paper No. 4312, 2009.
http://ssrn.com/abstract=1439185_2009 (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Devos, Thierry and Mahzarin R. Banaji. "American = White?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88, No. 3 (2005).
http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~mrbworks/articles/2005_JPSP.pdf (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Dewing, Michael. *Canadian Multiculturalism*. Canada Library of Parliament - Parliamentary Information and Research Service, 2009.
<http://www2.parl.gc.ca/content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0920-e.pdf> (accessed 04-19-2010).

- DiMaggio, Paul and Bart Bonikowski. "Varieties of Popular American Nationalism," Russell Sage Foundation, 2008.
<https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/u4/DiMaggio%20of%20Popular%20American%20Nationalism.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Dionne, Jr, E. J. and Kayla Meltzer Drogoz. "The Promise of National Service: A (Very) Brief History of an Idea," The Brookings Institution, 2003.
<http://www.ciaonet.org.libproxy.nps.edu/pbei/bi/die02> (accessed 04-06-2011).
- Donovan, Donald Francis and Anthea Roberts. "Note and Comment: The Emerging Recognition of Universal Civil Jurisdiction," *American Journal of International Law* 100 (2006). <http://www.asil.org/ajil/ajil1001.pdf> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Dostie Proulx, Pierre-Luc. "American Citizenship and Minority Rights," *Critique: A Worldwide Journal of Politics*, 2007.
<http://iilt.ilstu.edu/critique/spring07docs/dostie-proulx4.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Drug Enforcement Agency. *Dual Citizenship - Loyalty Statement*. Washington, D.C.: Drug Enforcement Agency - U.S. Department of Justice,
<http://www.justice.gov> (accessed 02-17-2011).
- Duncan, Natasha T. and Brigitte S. Waldorf. "Becoming a U.S. Citizen: The Role of Immigrant Enclaves," *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 11, No. 3 (2009).
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1583147 (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Durodie, Bill. "Home-Grown Nihilism: The Clash Within Civilizations," HomelandSecurity.org, 2007.
<http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/Search.aspx?s=radicalization> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Earnest, David C. "Neither Citizens nor Stranger: Why States Enfranchise Resident Aliens," *World Politics* 58, No. 2 (2006).
http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/world_politics/v058/58.2earnest.pdf (accessed 04-17-2011).
- Eastman, John C. "From Feudalism to Consent: Rethinking Birthright Citizenship," Heritage Foundation, 2006.
<http://www.heritage.org/Research/LegalIssues/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=95590> (accessed 12-09-2010).

- Elkins, Zachary and John Sides. "In Search of the Unified Nation-State: National Attachment among Distinctive Citizens." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, April 15 - 18, 2004. <http://www.mpsanet.org> (accessed 03-31-2011).
- Elliott, Emory. "Diversity in the United States and Abroad: What Does It Mean When American Studies Is Transnational?" *American Quarterly* 59, No. 1 (2007). <http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/aq/summary/v059/59.1elliott.htm> (accessed 04-08-2011).
- Elmi, Khadra. "Distant Voices and the Ties that Bind: Identity, Politics and Somali Diaspora Youth," Conciliation Resources, 2011. <http://www.c-r.org/our-work/accord/somalia/distant-voices.php> (accessed 02-16-2011).
- Evans, Tony. "Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization," *Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance* 25, No. 4. (2000). <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/4098269/citizenship-human-rights-age-globalization> (accessed 04-01-2011).
- Ewing, Walter. "Citizenship by the Numbers: The Demographic and Political Rise of Naturalized U.S. Citizens and the Native-Born Children of Immigrants." The Immigration Policy Center, 2009. http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Citizenship_by_the_Numbers_091609.pdf (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Faist, Thomas. "Dual Citizenship as a Path-Dependent Process (1)," *International Migration Review* 38, No. 3 (2004). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2004.tb00224.x/abstract> (accessed 04-01-2011).
- Fazzini, Olga. "National, Post-national or Trans-national? The Contested Nature of EU Citizenship." Paper presented at the ECPR (European Consortium for Political Research) Graduate Conference 2010, Dublin, Ireland. <http://air.unimi.it/bitstream/2434/153560/2/ECPR%20Fazzini.pdf> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. Form FD-1052: "Federal Bureau of Investigation Loyalty Agreement." Washington DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2009. <http://www.fbijobs.gov/employment/FD1052.pdf> (accessed 02-12-2011).
- Fix, Michael and Laureen Laglagaron. "Social Rights and Citizenship: An International Comparison," Working Group on Social Rights and Citizenship of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace Comparative Citizenship Project, August 2002. <http://www.ceip.org/pubs> (accessed 02-05-2011).

- Foner, Nancy. "Engagements across National Borders, Then and Now," *Fordham Law Review* 75, No. 5 (2007).
<http://law2.fordham.edu/publications/articles/500Fl=pub8270.pdf>
 (accessed 04-21-2011).
- . "Immigrant Commitment to America, Then and Now: Myths and Realities," *Citizenship Studies* 5, No. 1 (2001).
http://yorku.ca/gmcr/race_gender_class/citizenship_files/Foner2001.pdf
 (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Fonte, John. "Needed A Patriotic Assimilation Policy," *The Social Contract* 16, No. 3 (2006). <http://www.thesocialcontract.com> (accessed 04-22-2011).
- . "Dual Allegiance: A Challenge to Immigration Reform and Patriotic Assimilation," Center for Immigration Studies, 2005.
<http://www.cis.org/print/DualAllegiance-Assimilation> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- . "The Ideological War within the West," *Foreign Policy Research Institute* 3, No. 6 (2002). <http://seclists.org/interesting-people/2002/May/169>
 (accessed 04-22-2011).
- . "Liberal Democracy vs. Transnational Progressivism: The Future of the Ideological Civil War Within the West," *Orbis*, 2002. http://www.ngo-monitor.org/data/images/files/transnational_progressivism_08312002.pdf
 (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Fox Jr., James W. "Democratic Citizenship and Congressional Reconstruction: Defining and Implementing The Privileges and Immunities of Citizenship," *Stetson University College of Law Journal*, 2004.
<http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm?abstractid=653782> (accessed 02-04-2011).
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon. "Contract vs. Charity: Why is there no Social Citizenship in the United States?" *Socialist Review* 22 (1992).
<http://www.dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~kanderson/hist695c/Fraser.pdf>
 (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Fukuyama, Francis. "Identity, Immigration, and Liberal Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 17, No. 2 (2006).
<http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/gratis/Fukuyama-17-2.pdf>
 (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Gallis, Paul, Kristin Archick, Francis Miko, and Steven Woehrel. "Muslims in Europe: Integration Policies in Selected Countries." Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress - Congressional Research Service, 2005.
<http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33166.pdf> (accessed 02-15-2011).

- Galston, William A. "The Meaning of American Citizenship: What We Can Learn from Disputes over Naturalization," The Brookings Institution, 2008. http://www.aei.org/doclib/20081015_Galston.pdf (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Gans, Judith. "Citizenship in the Context of Globalization," The University of Arizona, 2005. <http://udallcenter.arizona.edu/immigration/publications/Citizenship%20and%20Globalization.pdf> (accessed 02-15-2011).
- . "Then and Now: Today's Echos of the Progressive Era," The University of Arizona - Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy - Immigration Policy Working Papers, 2005. <http://udallcenter.arizona.edu/immigration/publications/Then%20and%20How.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Geschiere, Peter and Stephen Jackson. "Autochthony and the Crisis of Citizenship: Democratization, Decentralization and the Politics of Belonging," *African Studies Review* 49, No. 2 (2006). http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/african_studies/v049/49.2geschiere.pdf (accessed 04-17-2011).
- Globalization and Governance: Contemplating the Global Village. Ottawa, Canada: Canada Library of Parliament, 2003. <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/cp9-e.htm> (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Glover, Robert W. "'Scattergories': Towards an Agnostic Critique of the Recategorization of American Citizenship in a Globalized Era." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, August 28 - 31, 2008. <http://www.aspanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Gordon, Susan. "Integrating Immigrants: Morality and Loyalty in U.S. Naturalization Practice," University of California, San Diego - The Center for Comparative Immigration Status, Working Paper 160, 2008. <http://www.ccis.org/PUBLICATIONS/wrkg/60.pdf> (accessed 02-07-2011).
- Greve, Michael S. and Michael Zoller, eds. "Citizenship in America and Europe - Beyond the Nation-State?" Washington, D.C.: The AEI Press, 2009. <http://www.aei.org> (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Grigsby, Carol Armistead. "Binding the Nation: National Service in America," *Parameters*: 109 (2008-2009). <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&doc=107633&coll=limited> (accessed 04-08-2011).

- Grossman, Andrew. "Birthright Citizenship as Nationality of Convenience." Paper presented at The Council of Europe conference on "Nationality and the Child," Strasbourg, Austria, October 11 - 12, 2004.
<http://www.uniset.ca/naty/maternity> (accessed 01-04-2011).
- Guimezanes, Nicole. "What Laws for Naturalisation?". *The OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) Observer*, No. 188 (1994).
<http://libproxy.nps.edu/login?url=http://proquest.umi.com.libproxy.nps.edu/pqdweb?did=915159&Fmt=7&clientId=11969&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed 08-27-2010).
- Haddal, Chad C. "Policy Challenges in International Migration." Washington DC: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Report No. R40753 (2009). <http://www.hsdl.org/?view&doc=112692&coll=limited> (accessed 02-15-2011).
- Hagan, Jacqueline Maria. "Negotiating Social Membership in the Contemporary World," *Social Forces* 85, No. 2 (2006).
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_forces/v085/85.2hagan.html (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Harty, Siobhan. "Transforming Citizenship Policy: Ideational and Discursive Processes in Public Policy-Making." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Montreal, Canada, June 1 - 3, 2010. <http://www.cpsa-acsp.ca> (accessed 06-08-2011).
- Hayward, Clarissa Rile. "Binding Problems, Bounding Problems: The Trouble with 'Democratic Citizenship'". Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August 27 - 31, 2003. <http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Heisler, Martin O. "Changing Citizenship Theory and Practice - Comparative Perspectives in a Democratic Framework," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38, No. 4 (2005).
<http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/heisler/Citizenship.htm> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Helbling, Marc. "Nationalism and Democracy: Competing or Complementary Logics?" *Living Reviews in Democracy* 1 (2009).
<http://democracy.livingreviews.org/index.php/lrd/article/viewArticle/lrd-2009-7/19> (accessed 04-17-2011).
- Henderson, William. "Dual Citizenship and Security Clearances," ClearanceJobs.com, 2009. <http://www.clearancejobs.com> (accessed 02-18-2011).

- Herzog, Ben. "Locating Citizenship between Exclusion and Inclusion: The Revocation of Citizenship in the United States." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, July 31, 2008.
http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p239277_index.html (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Ho, Elaine Lynn-Ee. "'Flexible Citizenship' or Familial Ties that Bind? Singaporean Transmigrants in London," *International Migration* 46, No. 4 (2008). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2435.2008.00475.x/full> (accessed 04-24-2011).
- Ho, James, Margaret Stock, Eric Ward, and Elizabeth Wydra. "Made in America: Myths and Facts about Birthright Citizenship," Immigration Policy Center, 2009.
<http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Birthright%20Citizenship%20091509.pdf> (accessed 12-09-2010).
- Homeland Security Council. National Strategy for Homeland Security. Washington DC: Homeland Security Council.
http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf (accessed 06-20-2010).
- Honohan, Iseult. "Civic Integration: Does Identity Come into It? A Republican Perspective." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 3 - 6, 2009.
<http://papers.ssrn.com> (accessed 08-20-2010).
- Howard, Marc Morje. "Comparative Citizenship: An Agenda for Cross-National Research," *Perspectives on Politics* 4, No. 3 (2006).
<http://www18.georgetown.edu/data/people/mmh/publication-12332.pdf> (accessed 04-14-2011).
- . "Liberalising Change or Continued Restrictiveness? Explaining Variation in Citizenship Laws in EU Countries," University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland. http://www.ucd.ie/norface/papers/maa_howard.pdf (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Howard-Hassmann, Rhoda E. "'Canadian' as an Ethnic Category: Implications for Multiculturalism and National Unity," *Canadian Public Policy* XXV, No. 4 (1999). <http://qed.econ.queensu.ca/pub/cpp/doc1999/Howard.pdf> (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Huntington, Samuel P. *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 2004.

- . "The West Unique, Not Universal," *Foreign Affairs* 75, No. 6 (1996).
http://www.hum.aau.dk/~sis/Eksamen/E09/Huntington_The_%20West_Unique_Not_Universal.pdf (accessed 05-09-2011).
- . "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, No. 3 (1993).
<http://www.polsci.wvu.edu/faculty/hauser/PS103/Readings/HuntingtonClashOfCivilizationsforAPFSummer93.pdf> (accessed 05-09-2011).
- Ibrahim, Raymond. "Can American Values Radicalize Muslims Both Here and Abroad?" 2011. <http://pajamasmedia.com/blog> (accessed 02-16-2011).
- Jacobson, Robin. "Characterizing Consent: Race, Citizenship, and the New Restrictionists," *Political Research Quarterly* 59, No. 4 (2006).
www.jstor.org/stable/4148066 (accessed 12-09-2010).
- Janoski, Thomas. "From Manifest Destiny to Multi-Cultural Diversity - The Causes of Naturalization Law in the United States, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand." Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Sociological Association, Montreal, Canada, 2006. <http://www.asanet.org> (accessed 02-05-2011).
- Jansen, Th., N. Chioncel, and H. Dekkers. "Social Cohesion and Integration: Learning Active Citizenship." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27, No. 2 (2006). www.jstor.org/stable/30036129 (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Jedwab, Jack. "Dually Divided? The Risks of Linking Debates over Citizenship to Attachment to Canada." *International Journal* 63, No. 1 (2007-2008).
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/40204486> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Johnson, Kevin R. and Bernard Trujillo. "Immigration Reform, National Security After September 11, and the Future of North American Integration." Davis, California: University of California, Davis School of Law, 2007.
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=962963> (accessed 03-13-2011).
- Joppke, Christian. "Transformation of Immigrant Integration: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany," *World Politics* 59, No. 2 (2007).
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v059/59.2joppke.html (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Joppke, Christian. "The Legal-Domestic Sources of Immigrant Rights: The United States, Germany, and the European Union," *Comparative Political Studies* 34, No. 4 (2001). <http://cps.sagepub.com/content/34/4/339.full.pdf> (accessed 12-15-2010).

- Keane, John. "Nations, Nationalism, and the European Citizen," *CSD Perspectives* No. 2 (1993).
<http://www.ciaonet.org.libproxy.nps.edu/wps/kej01/> (accessed 02-04-2011).
- Kerwin, Donald and Margaret D. Stock. "National Security and Immigration Policy: Reclaiming Terms, Measuring Success, and Setting Priorities." *Bepress Legal Series*, Working Paper 1862.
<http://law.bepress.com.libproxy.nps.edu/expresso/eps/1862> (accessed 11-20-2010).
- Kini, Tara. "Sharing the Vote: Noncitizen Voting Rights in Local School Board Elections," *California Law Review* 93, no. 1 (2005).
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/3481392> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Klicperova-Baker, Martina. "'Citizenship' and 'European Citizenship' as Qualitative and Legal Concepts - Typology of Citizenship and the EU." Paper presented at Political Studies Association 2010 Conference, Edinburgh, Scotland, March 29 - April 1, 2010.
http://www.psa.ac.uk/journals/pdf/5/2010/1168_1022.pdf (accessed 03-31-2011).
- Knahr, Christina. "International Decision: Accession to European Union - Bilateral Investment Treaties -- Arbitration -- Jurisdiction -- Determination -- of Citizenship -- Restitution," *American Journal of International Law* (2010).
<https://litigation-essentials.lexisnexis.com/webcd/app?action=DocumentDisplay&crawlid=1&doctype=cite&docid=104+A.J.I.L.+81&srctype=smi&srcid=3B15&key=6d39821c7c29a1ad6e679228cb5dfa09> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Knop, Karen. "The Private Side of Citizenship." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law, 101 (2007).
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25660164> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Kochin, Michael Shalom. "The Constitution of Nations," *The Good Society* 14, No. 3 (2005).
http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/good_society/v014/14.3kochin.pdf (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Kostakopoulou, Dora. "Thick, Thin and Thinner Patriotisms: Is This All There Is?" *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 26, No. 1 (2006).
<http://ojls.oxfordjournals.org/content/26/1/73.full.pdf> (accessed 04-15-2011).

- Krikorian, Mark. "The Security Costs of Immigration," Center for Immigration Studies, 2003. <https://www.hsdl.org> <http://www.cis.org/articles/2003/makesecurityoped203.html> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Kunovich, Robert M. "The Sources and Consequences of National Identification," *American Sociological Review* 74, No. 4 (2008). <http://asr.sagepub.com/content/74/4/573.full.pdf> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Kymlicka, Will. "Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence," *Canadian Journal of Political Science/ Revue Canadienne De Science Politique* 43, No. 2 (2010). http://www.soc.aau.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/kbm/Vof/kursan/2011/Multiculturalism/Will_Kymlicka_testing_the-Liberal_multiculturalist.pdf (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Lapp, Kevin. "Reforming the Good Moral Character Requirement of U.S. Citizenship." New York University School of Law - New York University Public Law and Legal Theory, Working Papers, 2011. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstracts_id=1799524 (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Lawler, Peter Augustine. "The Nation, Democratic Self-Government, and Liberalism: A Conservative View of Europe Today," *SAIS Review* 30, No. 1 (2010). http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.nps.edu/search/results?action=navigate&search_id=0809277536&min=301 (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Lee, Margaret Mikyung. "Birthright Citizenship Under the 14th Amendment of Persons Born in the United States to Alien Parents." Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress - Congressional Research Service, 2010. <http://www.hsdl.org> (accessed 01-04-2011).
- Lefkowitz, David. "Civic Virtue and the Obligations of Citizenship." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 28 - 31, 2003. <http://www.aspanet.org> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Leitner, Helga. "Local Lives, Transitional Ties, and the Meaning of Citizenship: Somali Histories and Herstories from Small Town America," *Bildhaan*: 44. http://www.ciaonet.org.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/bildhaan/v4.olf_0021334_17738.pdf (accessed 04-06-2011).
- Levinson, Amanda. "Regularisation Programmes in the United States," *Compas - Centre de Migration, Policy & Society*. 2005. <http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/Reports/Country%20Case%20US.pdf> (accessed 04-24-2011)

- Levy, Jacob T. "Federalism, Liberalism, and the Separation of Loyalties," *The American Political Science Review* 101, No. 3 (2007). <http://profs-polisci.mcgill.ca/levy/Levy-Federalism-APSR.pdf> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Lien, Pei-te. "Transnational Homeland Concerns and Participation in US Politics: A Comparison among Immigrants from China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong," *Journal of Chinese Overseas* 2, No. 1 (2006). http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_chinese_overseas/v002/2.1lien.html (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Lister, Ruth. "Inclusive Citizenship: Realizing the Potential," *Citizenship Studies* 11, No. 1 (2009). <http://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/bitstream/2134/2524/3/citstudies06%255b1%255d.pdf> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Loewy, Arnold H. "Are We Moving Towards Requiring Citizens to Carry Identification Cards and Would This Be a Good Thing?" Social Science Research Network Electronic Library. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1887422 (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Lukose, Ritty. "Empty Citizenship: Protesting Politics in the Era of Globalization," *Cultural Anthropology* 20, No. 4 (2005). <http://www.ucpress.edu/journals/rights.htm> (accessed 03-02-2011).
- Lyon, David. "National IDs in a Global World: Surveillance, Security, and Citizenship," *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law* 42 (2009). http://www.case.edu/org/jil/vol.42/42_lyon.pdf (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Maas, Willem. "Challenges of European Citizenship." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, September 1, 2006. <http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 05-06-2011).
- MacDonald, Fiona. "(Re)conceiving Citizenship: the Welfare-Multiculturalism Dynamic." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, 2007. <http://www.aspanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Macedo, Stephen. "The Moral Dilemma of U.S. Immigration Policy: Open Borders versus Social Justice?" Chap. 5, In *Debating immigration*, edited by Carol M. Swain, 63. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Mahtani, Minelle. "Interrogating the Hyphen-Nation: Canadian Multicultural Policy and 'Mixed Race' Identities," *Social Identities* 8, No. 1 (2002).
http://www.chrc.ccdp.ca/pdf/forum_2008_forum/interrogatinghyphennation.pdf (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Maira, Sunaina. "Flexible Citizenship/Flexible Empire: South Asian Muslim Youth in Post 9/11 America," *American Quarterly* 60, No. 3 (2008).
http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.3maira.pdf (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Major, Claire Howell and Maggi Savin-Baden. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Synthesis: Managing the Information Explosion in Social Science Research*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2010.
- Mamann, Guidy. "Canada, U.S. Differ on Dual Citizenship: National Loyalty a Bigger Issue South of the Border." Migrationlaw.com, 2006.
<http://www.migrationlaw.com> (accessed 02-17-2011).
- Mancini, J. M. and Graham Finlay. "'Citizenship Matters': Lessons from the Irish Citizenship Referendum." *American Quarterly* 60, No. 3 (2008).
http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/american_quarterly/v060/60.3.mancini.pdf (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Mantu, Sandra. "Not so Ideal British Citizens: Deprivation of Citizenship in the United Kingdom." Paper presented at the "Enacting European Citizenship" Conference, Open University, 2010. <http://www.allacademic.com/> (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Marchetti, Raffaele. "Toward a World Migratory Regime," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 15, No. 2 (2008).
http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/indiana_journal_of_global_legal_studies/v015/15.2.marchetti.pdf (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Marshall, M. "Dual Nationality does not Preclude Civic Loyalty, Martin says." *Virginia Law*, 2004.
http://www.law.virginia.edu/html/news/2004_fall/martin.htm (accessed 02-17-2011).
- Martin, Jack. "Immigration and National Security: A Checklist of Unfinished Reforms." Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), 2008.
http://www.fairus.org/site/DocServer/2008_911Report.pdf (accessed 02-14-2011).
- Martinez, George A. "Immigration and the Meaning of United States Citizenship: Whiteness and Assimilation." *Washburn Law Journal* 46, No. 2 (2007).
<http://www.washburnlaw.edu/wlj/46-2/articles/martinez-george.pdf> (accessed 03-29-2011).

- Mazzolari, Francesca. "Dual Citizenship Rights: Do They Make More and Richer Citizens?" *Demography* 46, No. 1 (2009).
<http://muse.jhu.libproxy.nps.edu/journals/demography/v046/46.1.mazzolari.pdf> (accessed 04-14-2011).
- McDougall, Heather R. "Making the Impossible Possible: Global Citizenship in Morality, Education, and Practice." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1, 2005.
http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/apsa/apsa05/index.php?click_key=2 (accessed 02-15-2011).
- McGrew, Tony. "Globalisation and Democracy," *CSD Bulletin* 6, No. 1 (1998).
http://www.ciaonet.org.libproxy.nps.edu/pbei/west/aut98/csd_autumn98.pdf (accessed 04-06-2011).
- Meese II, Edwin and Matthew Spalding. "Backgrounder - The Principles of Immigration." The Heritage Foundation, 2004. <https://www.hsdl.org> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Minkenberg, Michael. "Church, State, and the Politics of Citizenship: A Comparative Study of 19 Western Democracies." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, August 28–31. 2008. <http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Mitchell, James. "Citizenship in a Multi-tiered Polity." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September 1–4, 2005. <http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Modood, Tariq. "Remaking Multiculturalism after 7/7." Open Democracy.net, 2005. <http://www.opendemocracy.net/content/articles/PDF/2879.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Moghaddam, Fathali M. *Multiculturalism and Intergroup Relations: Psychological Implications for Democracy in Global Context*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2008.
- Motomura, Hiroshi. "Comment - Choosing Immigrants, Making Citizens." Social Science Research Network Electronic Library, 2007.
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=960408 (accessed 04-01-2011).
- Mueller, Dennis C. "Defining Citizenship," *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 3, No. 1 (2002). <http://www.bepress.com/til/default/vol3/iss1/art6/> (accessed 04-01-2011).

- National Immigration Forum. *Making Our Immigration System More Secure to Guard against Terrorism*. Washington DC: National Immigration Forum, 2001, <http://www.immigrationforum.org/images/uploads/securitybackgrounder.pdf> (accessed 02-09-2011).
- National Security Strategy, Washington, D.C., 2010, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf (accessed 06-20-2010).
- Neuman, Gerald L. "The Resilience of Nationality." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of International Law, March 28 - 31, 2007. <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/25660165> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Ngai, Mae M. "Birthright Citizenship and the Alien Citizen," *Fordham Law Review* 75 (2007). <http://law2.fordham.edu/publications/articles/500flspub8272.pdf> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Nimer, Mohamed. "The Muslim Brotherhood in America: Citizens with Foreign Attachments?" *Middle East Policy* XVII, No. 4 (2010). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1475-4967.2010.00468.x/full> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Nussbaum, Martha. "Kant and Cosmopolitanism." In *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, edited by James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, 25. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1997.
- . "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." *Boston Review* XIX, No. 5 (1994). <http://bostonreview.net/BR19.5/nussbaum.php> (accessed 04-19-2010).
- Nyers, Peter. "The Accidental Citizen: Acts of Sovereignty and (Un)making Citizenship," *Economy and Society* 35, No. 1 (2006). <http://www.mendeley.com/research/accidental-citizen-acts-sovereignty-un-making-citizenship/> (accessed 12-09-2010).
- Okoli, Ifezue. *Tribalizing America: A Social Evolution of the American Society*. Bloomington, IN: Author House, 2004.
- Olsen, Florian. "Why doesn't Anybody Give a Shit? Iraq: The Home Front, and the 'Crisis' of the American Imperial Society." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 17 - 20, 2010. http://www.allacademia.com/one/prol/pro/o1/index.php?/click_key=1 (accessed 04-13-2011).

- Olson, Kevin. "Paradoxes of Constitutional Democracy," *American Journal of Political Science* 51, No. 2 (2007).
<http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.nps.edu/stable/4620069> (accessed 04-08-2011).
- Panov, Petr. "Nation-Building in Post-Soviet Russia: What Kind of Nationalism is Produced by the Kremlin?" *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 1 (2010).
http://www.sciencedirect.com.libproxy.nps.edu/science?_ob=Article (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Paoletti, Sarah. "Making Visible the Invisible: Strategies for Responding to Globalization's Impact on Immigrant Workers in the United States," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 13, No. 1 (2006).
http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1322&context=ijgls&seiredir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2Fsearch%3Fq%3DMaking%2BVisible%2Bthe%2BInvisible%253A%2BStrategies%2Bfor%2BResponding%2Bto%2BGlobalization%2527s%2BImpact%2Bon%2BImmigrant%2BWorkers%2Bin%2Bthe%2BUnited%2BStates%26btnG%3DSearch%26hl%3Den%26gbv%3D2%26gs_sm%3De%26gs_upl%3D492149914922515101492545513121010101019691146915-1.11210%26oq%3DMaking%2BVisible%2Bthe%2BInvisible%253A%2BStrategies%2Bfor%2BResponding%2Bto%2BGlobalization%2527s%2BImpact%2Bon%2BImmigrant%2BWorkers%2Bin%2Bthe%2BUnited%2BStates%26aq%3Df%26aqi%3D%26aq%3D1#search=%22Making%20Visible%20Invisible%3A%20Strategies%20Responding%20Globalizations%20Impact%20Immigrant%20Workers%20United%20States%22 (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Penn, Elizabeth Maggie. "Citizenship versus Ethnicity: The Role of Institutions in Shaping Identity Choice," *The Journals of Politics* 70, No. 4 (2008).
[http://penn.wustl.edu/stie/Washington University in St. Louis files/ldhpp.pdf](http://penn.wustl.edu/stie/Washington%20University%20in%20St.%20Louis%20files/ldhpp.pdf) (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Pison, Gilles. "The Number and Proportion of Immigrants in the Population: International Comparisons," *Population & Societies* No. 472 (2010).
<http://www.ined.fr> (accessed 11-23-2010).
- Preuss, Ulrich K. "The Ambiguous Meaning of Citizenship." Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Law School - The Center for Comparative Constitutionalism, 2003. <http://ccc.uchicago.edu/docs/preuss.pdf> (accessed 03-29-2011).

- Reeskens, Tim and Marc Hooghe. "Beyond the Civic-Ethnic Dichotomy: Investigating the Structure of Citizenship Concepts across Thirty-three Countries," *Nations and Nationalism - Journal of the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism* 16, No. 4: (2010). <http://arno.uvt.nl/show.cgi?fid=113480> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Renshon, Stanley A. "Allowing Non-Citizens to Vote in the United States? Why Not?" Washington, D.C.: Center for Immigration Studies, Center Paper 26, 2008. <http://www.cis.org> (accessed 04-08-2011).
- . *The 50% American: Immigration and National Identity in an Age of Terror*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 2005.
- . "Dual Citizenship and American National Identity." Washington DC: Center for Immigration Studies, 2001. <http://www.cis.org> (accessed 04-24-2011).
- Rhodes, Sybil D. "The Comparative Politics of Formal and *De facto* Multiple Citizenship: How Do Countries treat Their Citizens Who Leave?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August 2003. <http://www.aspanet.org> (accessed 03-31-2011).
- Rosenblum, Marc R. "Immigrant Legalization in the United States and European Union: Policy Goals and Program Design." Migration Policy Institute, 2010. <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/legalization-policydesign.pdf> (accessed 04-08-2011)
- Rubenstein, Edwin. "Dual Citizenship Goes Global - The Numbers Affect the Issue," *The Social Contract* 13, No. 3 (2003). http://thesocialcontract.com/artman2/publish/tsc1303/article_1147.shtml (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Rubenstein, Kim. "Rethinking Nationality in International Law." Paper presented at the annual meeting of The American Society of International Law, March 28 - 31, 2007. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25660166> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- . "Globalisation and Citizenship and Nationality." Melbourne, Australia: The University of Melbourne Faculty of Law Legal Studies, Research Paper No. 69, 2004. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=530382> (accessed 04-14-2011).
- Rubenstein, Kim and Daniel Adler. "International Citizenship: The Future of Nationality in a Globalised World," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 7, No. 2 (2000). <http://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/ijgls/vol7/iss2/4> (accessed 03-29-2011).

- Rudolph, Christopher. "National Security and Immigration in the United States after 9/11." University of California, San Diego - The Center for Comparative Immigration Status, 2007.
<http://www.sas.upenn.edu/dcc/documents/ChrisRudolphPaper.doc>
(accessed 4/24/2011).
- Rudolph, Christopher. "Sovereignty and Territorial Borders in a Global Age," *International Studies Review* 7, No. 1(2005). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699618> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Saito, Natsu Taylor. "Reflections on Homeland and Security," *CR: The New Centennial Review* 6, No. 1 (2006).
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/new_centennial_review/v006/6.1saito.html
(accessed 04-15-2011).
- Schildkraut, Deborah J. "Defining American Identity in the Twenty-First Century: How Much "There" is There?" *The Journal of Politics* 69, No. 3 (2007).
<http://ase.tufts.edu/polisci/faculty/schildkraut/JOP2007.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Schuck, Peter H. "Citizen Terrorist." Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Hoover Institution. 2010. <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/58011> (accessed March 5, 2011).
- . "The Meaning of Citizenship in a Post-9/11 World." Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository, Faculty Scholarship Series, Paper 1673, 2007.
http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2658&context=fss_paper&sci-redir=1#search= (accessed 04-07-2011).
- . "Citizenship in a Post-9/11 World: An Exchange between Peter H. Schuck and David D. Cole," New Dimensions of Citizenship Symposium - Fordham University School of Law, September 30, 2006
<http://law2.fordham.edu> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- . "Citizenship in Federal Systems." Yale Law School Legal Scholarship Repository, 2000. http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/fss_papers/1661
(accessed 04-07-2011).
- Schuck, Peter H. *Citizens, Strangers, and In-Betweens: Essays on Immigration and Citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1998.
- Shachar, Ayelet and Ran Hirschl. "Citizenship as Inherited Property," *Political Theory* 35, No. 3 (2007).
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1138003 (accessed 04-21-2011).

- Shachar, Ayelet. "The Worth of Citizenship in an Unequal World," *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 8, No. 2 (2007).
<http://www.lexisnexis.com.libproxy.nps.edu/lnacui2api/delivery/> (accessed 12-09-2010).
- Shipper, Apichai W. "Parables of Citizenship: Morality, Personhood, and Immigration Politics in Japan, the United States, and Sweden." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA, August 28–31, 2008. <http://apsanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Skerry, Peter. "Citizenship Begins At Home: A New Approach to the Civic Integration of Immigrants," *The Responsive Community* 14, No. 1 (2003).
http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2003/winter_immigration_skerry.aspx (accessed April 27, 2011).
- Smith, Anthony. "'Set in the Silver Sea': English National Identity and European Integration." Paper presented at the Workshop: National Identity and Euroscepticism: A Comparison Between France and the United Kingdom, University of Oxford, Centre for the Study of Democratic Government, Oxford, UK, May 13, 2005
http://oxpo.politics.ox.ac.uk/materials/national_identity/Smith_paper.pdf (accessed 04-13-2011).
- Smith, Evan. "Being as Being: A Phenomenology of Citizenship Amid the Crisis of Modern Nihilism." Simon Fraser University, SFU Harbour Centre, 2006.
<http://journals.s.sfu.ca/humanitas/index.php/humanities/article/viewfile/6/10> (accessed 04-07-2011).
- Smith, Rogers M. "The Challenges Facing American Citizenship Today," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38, No. 4 (2005).
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30044349> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- . "The Meaning of American Citizenship." American Political Science Association. <http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 04-22-2011). Authors, Primary
- Song, Sarah. "What Does it Mean to be an American?" *Daedalus*, 2009.
<http://www.mitpressjournals.org.libproxy.nps.edu/doi/pdf/10.1162/daed.2009.138.2.31> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Spalding, Matthew. "Making Citizens: The Case for Patriotic Assimilation." The Heritage Foundation, 2006.
http://thf.medias3.amazonaws.com/2006/pdf/95152_1.pdf (accessed 04-20-2011).

- Spiro, Peter J. "Embracing Dual Nationality." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1998.
<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=vicw&id=174&prog=zgp> (accessed 02-04-2011).
- Spiro, Peter J. and Linda Bosniak. "An Emerging International Law of Citizenship?" *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting (American Society of International Law)* 101(2007). <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25660163> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Stainbrook, Mark G. "Policing with Muslim Communities in the Age of Terrorism," *The Police Chief - the Professional Voice of Law Enforcement*, 32 (2010).
http://policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display&article_id=2050&issue_id=42010 (accessed 09-01-2010).
- Staton, Jeffrey K., Robert A. Jackson, and Damarys Canache. "Costly Citizenship? Dual Nationality Institutions, Naturalization, and Political Connectedness," Florida State University.
<http://mailler.fsu.edu/~jstaton/costlyc.pdf> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- Stoll, David. "Which American Dream Do You Mean?" *Sociology* 46, (2009).
<http://www.springerlink.com/index/k4230j8t87jv416w.pdf> (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Straughn, Jeremy Brooke. "Being and Becoming American: National Identity as Idealization and Boundary Maintenance." Purdue University
http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/8/3/1/2/pages183127/p183127-1.php (accessed 04-22-2011).
- Stubbs, Sukhvinder. "Britishness and the Habits of Solidarity," *Renewal* 16, No. 1(2011). <http://www.scribd.com/doc/50822386/9/Britishness-and-the-habits-of-solidarity> (accessed 04-01-2011).
- Swain, Carol M., ed. *Debating Immigration*. 4th ed. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Talbot, Winthrop. *Americanization - Principles of Americanism, Essentials of Americanization, Technic of Race-Assimilation*. New York, NY: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1917. <http://books.google.com> (accessed 03-29-2011).
- Tambini, Damian. "Post-National Citizenship," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24, No. 2 (2001). <http://ilhevro.haifa.ac.il/~soc/lecturers/smootha/files/1776.pdf> (accessed 04-07-2011).

- Task Force on New Americans. "Building an Americanization Movement for the Twenty-first Century: A Report to the President of the United States from the Task Force on New Americans." Washington DC: Task Force on New Americans, 2008. <http://www.uscis.gov/files/nativedocuments/M-708.pdf> (accessed 12-15-2010).
- Theiss-Morse, Elizabeth. *Who Counts as an American? The Boundaries of National Identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. 2009.
- Thomassen, Jacques and Hanna Back. "European Citizenship and Identity after Enlargement." European University Institute - Department of Political and Social Sciences, EUI Working Papers SPS, 2008. <http://www.eui.eu/> (accessed 02-15-2011).
- Tierney, Stephen. "Reframing Sovereignty? Sub-State National Societies and Contemporary Challenges to the Nation-State," *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 54, No. 1 (2005).
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayAbstract?fromPage=online&aid=1524060> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Ting, Jan C. "E-notes Immigration and National Security." Foreign Policy Research Institute, 2005.
<http://www.fpri.org/orbis/5001/ting.immigrationnationalsecurity.pdf> (accessed 02-14-2011).
- Um, Khatharya. "Diasporic Nationalism, Citizenship, and Post-War Reconstruction." York University, 2002.
<http://pi.library.yorku.ca/ojs/index.php/refuge/article/viewfile/21350/20020> (accessed 04-20-2011).
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *Adjudicator's Field Manual, Chapter 75, Section 75.3 "Ceremony-related Issues"*. Washington DC: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
<http://dhsconnect.dhs.gov/uscis/workingresources/Source/docView/AFM/HTML/AFM/0-0-0-1/0-0-0-26406/0-0-0-27044.html#0-0-0-2390> (accessed 10-19-2011).
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *Building an Americanization Movement for the Twenty-first Century*, Washington, D.C., 2008,
<http://www.uscis.gov/files/nativedocuments/M-708.pdf> (accessed 03-07-2011).
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *The Citizen's Almanac*. Washington, D.C., 2010,
<http://www.uscis.gov/USCIS/Office%20of%20Citizenship/Citizenship%20Resource%20Center%20Site/Publications/M-76.pdf> (accessed 04-01-2011).

- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *Citizenship Foundation Skills and Knowledge Clusters*, Washington, D.C., 2010, <http://www.uscis.gov/USCIS/Office%20of%20Citizenship/Citizenship%20Resource%20Center%20Site/Publications/PDFs/M-794.pdf> (accessed 04-01-2011).
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *Fact Sheet: Task Force on New Americans*, Washington, D.C., 2006, <http://www.uscis.gov/portal/site/uscis/menuitem.5af9bb95919f35e66f614176543f6d1a/?vgnextoid=afc8ef590da4e110VgnVCM1000004718190aRCD&vgnnextchannel=68439c7755cb9010VgnVCM10000045f3d6a1RCRD> (accessed 04-01-2011).
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. *USCIS Strategic Plan 2008-2012*, Washington, D.C., 2008, http://www.uscis.gov/USCIS/About%20Us/Budget,%20Planning%20and%20Performance/USCIS_Strategic_Plan_2008-2012.pdf (accessed August 20, 2010).
- U.S. Department of Defense. *Summary of Major Changes to DoD 7000.14-R, volume 7B, chapter 6 "Foreign Citizenship after Retirement,"* Washington, D.C., 2009, http://comptroller.defense.gov/fmr/07b_06.pdf (accessed 04-21-2011).
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review Report: A Strategic Framework for a Secure Homeland*. Washington DC: Department of Homeland Security, 2010. www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/qhsr_report.pdf (accessed 06-20-2010).
- U.S. Department of Justice. *Eligibility of a Dual United States Citizen for a Paid Position with the Department of Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, 1999, <http://www.justice.gov/olc/dualcitizen.htm> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- U.S. Department of State. *Dual Citizenship - Security Clearance Implications*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, <http://state.gov> (accessed 02-17-2011).
- U.S. Department of State. *U.S. State Department Services - Dual Nationality*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, <http://travel.state.gov> (accessed 02-18-2011).
- van Eijken, Hanneke. "European Citizenship and the Competence of Member States to Grant and to Withdraw the Nationality of their Nationals," *Merkourios* 27, No. 72 (2010). <http://www.merkourios.org/index.php/mj/article/viewFile/UBN%3ANBN%3ANI%3A10-1-100927124> (accessed 04-07-2011).

- Varsanyi, Monica W. "Rescaling the "Alien," Rescaling Personhood: Neoliberalism, Immigration and the State," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98, No. 4 (2008).
<http://ccis.ucsd.edu/2009/01/rescaling-the-%E2%80%99Calien%E2%80%99D-rescaling-personhood-neoliberalism-immigration-and-the-state-working-paper-173/> (accessed 04-15-2011).
- Volpp, Leti. "Citizenship Undone," *Fordham Law Review* 75, No. 14 (2006-2007).
<http://law2.fordham.edu/publications/articles/500flspub8276.pdf> (accessed 03-31-2011).
- Wald, Kenneth D. "Homeland Interests, Hostland Politics: Politicized Ethnic Identity among Middle Eastern Heritage Groups in the United States," *The International Migration Review* 42, No. 2 (2008).
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7379.2008.00125.x/abstract> (accessed 04-21-2011).
- Wang, Ban. "Reimagining Political Community: Diaspora, Nation-State, and the Struggle for Recognition," *Modern Drama* 48, No. 2 (2005).
http://muse.jhu.edu/login?uri=/journals/modern_drama/v048/48.2wang.html (accessed 04-15-2011).
- West, Darrell M. *Brain Gain: Rethinking U.S. Immigration Policy*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2010.
- Williams, Melissa S. "On Peoples and Constitutions, Sovereignty and Citizenship." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL, September 2–5, 2004.
<http://www.apsanet.org> (accessed 03-30-2011).
- Y, Mr. "A National Strategic Narrative." Woodrow Wilson Center. 2011.
<http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/A%20National%20Strategic%20Narrative.pdf> (accessed 11-08-2011).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Jaime L. Benavides
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Washington, D.C.